LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS

052
EN
V.12

William Lawson

THE

ENGLISH REVIEW.

VOL. XII.

JUNE—DECEMBER.

LONDON:
FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, & WATERLOO PLACE.

1849.

LONDON:
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

DSR
EN
V.12

INDEX

OF

BOOKS REVIEWED.

*** For remarkable Passages in the Criticisms, Extracts, Notices, and Intelligence, see the Index at the end of the Volume.

Absolution, an Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Church of England. By the Rev. W. Maskell, M.A., 196.

Additional Curates' Aid Society, Manchester. Tracts and Thoughts for, 474.

Alford—The Greek Testament, with a critically-revised Text: and a Critical and Exegetical Commentary. By Henry Alford, M.A., Vicar of Wymeswold, 444.

Altar, a Companion to the. By Bishop Hobart. Edited by the Rev. J. Collingwood, M.A., 222.

Anderson—Addresses on Miscellaneous Subjects. By the Rev. J. S. M. Anderson, M.A., 222.

Antichrist: a Poem, with Notes and Sketches of Oriental Scenes. By the Rev. H. Newton, A.B., 468.

Architecture, the History of. By Edward Freeman, M.A., 214.

Atkinson—Twelve Short Sermons for Family Reading. By the Rev. J. Atkinson, 474.

Auricular Confession, a Letter from Kappa to Delta, 474.

Babington—Mr. Macaulay's Character of the Clergy. By C. Babington, M.A., 474.

Baptism Accompanied by Conditional and Unconditional Grace. By the Rev. C. R. Cameron, 474.

Barter—A Solemn Warning against the Doctrine of Special Grace; which causes Divisions in the Church, and prepares the way for Infidelity. By the Rev. W. B. Barter, 220.

Baxter—The Church History of England: from the Introduction of Christianity into England to the Present Time. By John A. Baxter, M.A., 212.

Bernays—The Life of Christians during the First Three Centuries of the Church. A Series of Sermons on Church History. By Dr. Chr. Ludw. Conrad. Translated from the German by the Rev. Leopold Bernays, 465.

Berry—A Review of the Mexican War, on Christian Principles. By the Rev. Philip Berry, A.B., 473.

Best—On Catechizing. By the Hon. and Rev. Samuel Best, 455.

Bible in every Land, the, 474.

Boutell—Christian Monuments of England and Wales. By the Rev. C. Boutell, 472.

Bowdler—A few Words of Family Instruction, introductory to Prayers for a Christian Household. By the Rev. T. Bowdler, M.A., 465.

Brandenburg, Memoirs of the House of, and History of Prussia during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. By Leopold Ranke. Translated from the German by Sir Alexander and Lady Duff Gordon, 395.

Browell, Rev. Mr.—Edition of Carwithen's History of the Church of England, 418.

Bulwer Lytton—The Caxtons, a Family Picture. By Sir E. Bulwer Lytton, Bart., 303.

"California," Stanzas. By M. H. P. Hall, 473.

Calvinism, an Examination of, by the Text of Holy Scripture and the Unanimous Teaching of the Church. By the Rev. W. Houghton, 451.

Cameron—Baptism Accompanied by Conditional and Unconditional Grace. By Rev. C. R. Cameron, 474.

Canada, the Conquest of. By the Author of "Hochelaga," 153.

Carwithen—History of the Church of England. By J. B. S. Carwithen, B.D., late of St. Mary Hall, Oxford, 418.

Catechizing. By the Hon. and Rev. Samuel Best, 455.

Cathedral Music and the Musical System of the Church, a Few Words on, with a Plan of Reform. By Samuel Sebastian Wesley, Mus. Doc., 88.

Cathedral Trusts and their Fulfilment. By the Rev. Robert Whiston, M.A., Head Master of the Cathedral Grammar School, Rochester, 88.

277518

Caxtons, the, a Family Picture. By Sir E. Bulwer Lytton, Bart., 303.
Chapters on Chivalry; or, The Ancient Knight. By John Fuller Russell, B.C.L., 222.
Christian Advocate, the, for 1840 *and* 1841. By the Rev. W. H. Mill, D.D., 281.
Christian Monuments of England and Wales. By the Rev. C. Boutell, 472.
Church Association in Parliament, the Necessity and Desirableness of, a Letter. By the Rev. F. Merewether, M.A., 474.
Churches, Descriptive Notices of the Ancient Parochial and Collegiate Churches of Scotland, 211.
Church History of England, the, from the Introduction of Christianity into England to the Present Time. By John A. Baxter, M.A., 212.
Church History. The Life of Christians during the First Three Centuries of the Church. A Sermon on Church History. By Dr. Chr. Ludw. Conrad. Translated from the German by the Rev. Leopold Bernays, 465.
Church of England, History of the. By J. B. S. Carwithen, B.D., late of St. Mary Hall, Oxford, 418.
Church, Outline of the Constitution and History of the, in Question and Answer. By the Rev. S. W. Mangin, 433.
Churchman's Companion, the, 471.
Coleridge—Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit, and some Miscellaneous Pieces. By Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Edited by Henry Nelson Coleridge, M.A., 247.
Collingwood—A Companion to the Altar. By Bishop Hobart. Edited by the Rev. J. Collingwood, M.A., 222.
Commentarius de Angelis. By Ode, 281.
Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit, and some Miscellaneous Pieces. By Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Edited by Henry Nelson Coleridge, Esq., M.A., 247.
Conrad—The Life of Christians during the First Three Centuries of the Church. A Series of Sermons on Church History. By Dr. Chr. Ludw. Conrad. Translated from the German by the Rev. Leopold J. Bernays, 465.
Corinthians, Annotations on St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians, &c. By Thomas Williamson Peile, D.D., 436.
Correspondence between Dr. McHale and the Poor Law Commissioners of Ireland, on the subject of the Chaplaincy of the Tuam Workhouse. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 441.
Correspondence between the Lord Bishop of Sydney and the Governor of New South Wales. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 441.
Cotterill—The Seven Ages of the Church; or, the Seven Apocalyptic Epistles interpreted by Church History. By the Rev. Henry Cotterill, M.A., 448.
Cutts—Manual for the Study of Sepulchral Slabs and Crosses of the Middle Ages. By the Rev. Edward L. Cutts, 472.
Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature Abridged. By John Kitto, D.D., 213.

Davidson — An Introduction to the New Testament; an Examination of the most important Questions relating to the Authority, Interpretation, and Integrity of the Canonical Books. By Samuel Davidson, LL.D., 466.
Dayman—The House of God. By the Rev. A. J. Dayman, 474.
Deacons—Chapters on. By the Author of "Hymns and Scenes of Childhood," 471.
Devout Christian (the), Thoughts on his Vocation, and a Manual of Devotion for his Use. By Thomas Frederick Smith, M.A., 465.
Dictation, Lessons for Writing from; adapted to the Use of Children in Village Schools. By William Ewart, M.A., 453.
Dowling—A Popular Natural History of Quadrupeds and Birds. By William Dowling, 221.

Eamonson—Observations on "The Doctrine of the Church of England as to the Effects of Baptism in the Case of Infants, by *W. Goode, M.A."* By the Rev. B. Eamonson, M.A.
Earth's Antiquity (the), in Harmony with the Mosaic Record of the Creation. By James Gray, M.A., Rector of Dibden, 450.
Ecclesiastical Affairs, Five Speeches on, Delivered by Edward Horsman, Esq., M.P., in the Sessions of 1847 and 1848. 88.
Ecclesiastical and Architectural Topography of England.—Buckinghamshire, 474.
Ecclesiastical and Architectural Topography of England. Published under the Sanction of the Central Committee of the Archæological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, 211.
Ecclesiastical Architecture in England, a History of. By George Ayliffe Poole, M.A., Vicar of Welford, 464.

Education, Minutes of the Committee of Council on. England and Wales. Schools of Parochial Unions, 107.
Emerson — Essays by R. W. Emerson. *Nature, an Essay. Orations, &c.*, 139.
Evans — Leicestershire Words, Phrases, and Proverbs. Collected by Arthur Evans, D.D., 453.
Evans—The First Revelation of God to Man, considered in a Series of Sermons on the First Chapters of Genesis. By the Rev. W. E. Evans, Prebendary of Hereford, 450.
Ewart—Lessons for Writing from Dictation, adapted to the Use of Children in Village Schools. By William Ewart, M.A., 453.

Fairclough—The Outlaw's Confession, and other Poems. By B. Fairclough, 473.
Family Instruction, a few Words of, introductory to Prayers for a Christian Household. By the Rev. T. Bowdler, M.A., 465.
Family Reading, Twelve Short Sermons for. By the Rev. J. Atkinson, 474.
Family Worship, a Sermon. By the Rev. J. D. Jefferson, 474.
Flight of the Apostate (the), a Poem, in Three Parts. With Thoughts on our present Pre-millennial State. By the Rev. H. Newton, 468.
Forbes—The Danger of Superficial Knowledge. Introductory Lecture to a Course of Natural Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh. By James D. Forbes, Esq., 465.
Francis—Chronicles and Characters of the Stock Exchange. By John Francis, 454.
Freeman — The History of Architecture. By Edward Freeman, M.A., 211.
Freemasonry, Letter on the Antichristian Character of, to the Rev. S. Carwithen, D.D. By M. C. Trevilian, Esq., 458.
Froude—The Nemesis of Faith. By J. A. Froude, M.A., 464.
Future, the Shadow of the. By a Layman, 474.

Garratt—Scripture Symbolism; or, Tabernacle Architecture. By the Rev. Samuel Garratt, 455.
Genesis—The First Revelation of God to Man, considered in a Series of Sermons on the First Chapters of Genesis. By the Rev. W. E. Evans, Prebendary of Hereford, 450.
Goode—Observations on "The Doctrine of the Church of England as to the Effects of Baptism in the case of Infants." By W. Goode, M.A." By the Rev. B. Eamonson, M.A., 220.
Good Gerard of Cologne, a Tale. By Carl Simrock, 216.
Gordon—Memoirs of the House of Brandenburg, and History of Prussia, during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. By Leopold Ranke. Translated from the German by Sir Alexander and Lady Duff Gordon, 395.
Gray—The Earth's Antiquity in Harmony with the Mosaic Record of the Creation. By James Gray, M.A., Rector of Dibden, 450.
Greek Testament, the; with a critically-revised Text, and a Critical and Exegetical Commentary. By Henry Alford, M.A., Vicar of Wymeswold, 444.
Green—Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. By the Rev. T. S. Green, 473.

Hall—"California," Stanzas. By M. H. P. Hall, 473.
Hardwick—An Historical Enquiry touching Saint Catherine of Alexandria; to which is added a Semi-Saxon Legend. By Charles Hardwick, M.A., 212.
Harington—The Reformation of the Anglican Church, and Mr. Macaulay's History of England. By E. C. Harington, M.A., Chancellor of the Cathedral Church of Exeter, 209.
Harrison—Prophetic Outlines of the Christian Church, and the Antichristian Power, as traced in the Visions of Daniel and St. John. By Archdeacon Harrison, 466.
Harvey—Two Sermons on the Duty of Keeping the Lord's Day, and the Manner in which it should be kept. By the Rev. Richard Harvey, 473.
Hebrew Characters derived from Hieroglyphics. The original Pictures applied to the Interpretation of various Words in the Sacred Writings. By John Lamb, D.D., Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 272.
Hieroglyphics, Hebrew Characters derived from. By John Lamb, D.D., Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 272.
Hincmar—The Life and Times of Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims. By the late Rev. James C. Prichard, M.A., 212.
Hobart—A Companion to the Altar. By Bishop Hobart. Edited by the Rev. J. Collingwood, M.A., 222.

Hofland—Life and Literary Remains of Barbara Hofland. By Thomas Ramsay, 455.

Hogg—Remarks on Mount Gerbal being the true Mount Sinai. By J. Hogg, Esq., 473.

Holy City, the. Historical, Topographical, and Antiquarian Notices of Jerusalem. By George Williams, B. D. *Second edition, with additions, including an Architectural History of the Church of the Holy Scriptures.* By the Rev. R. Willis, M.A., 171.

Holy Eucharist, the. By the Rev. J. Marshall, 474.

Horsman—Five Speeches on Ecclesiastical Affairs, delivered by Edward Horsman, Esq., M.P., in the Sessions of 1847 *and* 1848, 88.

Houghton—An Examination of Calvinism, by the Text of Holy Scripture and the Teaching of the Church. By the Rev. W. Houghton, Curate of Sennen, Cornwall, 451.

Howell—Westminster Abbey, a Poem. By O. Howell, 473.

Humboldt—Letters to a Lady. By the Baron Wilhelm von Humboldt. From the German, 449.

Intemperance. Report to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. By the Committee for the Suppression of Intemperance; given in and read by Rev. Robert H. Muir, Convener, 458.

Italy, Correspondence respecting the Affairs of, presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty, July, 1849, 344.

Jackson—The Day of Prayer and Day of Thanksgiving. Two Sermons. By the Rev. J. Jackson, 474.

Jackson—The Sinfulness of Little Sins. A Course of Sermons preached in Lent. By John Jackson, M.A., Rector of St. James's, Westminster, 447.

Jefferson—Family Worship; a Sermon. By the Rev. J. D. Jefferson, 474.

Jesuits at Rome, Mornings amongst the. By the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour, 30.

Joel.—The Book of the Prophet Joel. A Specimen of a Hebrew Bible, arranged on a System of Parallelism, 474.

Johns—History of Spain, for Young Persons. By the Rev. B. G. Johns, M.A., 463.

Judith; or, the Prophetess of Bethulia. A Romance from the Apocrypha, 453.

Kelly—Fourth Series of Lectures on Subjects connected with Prophecy. Preached by the Rev. James Kelly, M.A., 456.

Kennaway—An Ordination Sermon. By Rev. C. E. Kennaway, 474.

Kingdom of God, the. A Sermon. By the Rev. T. Lowe, 474.

Kingsley—The Saint's Tragedy; or, the True Story of Elizabeth of Hungary, Landgravine of Thuringia, Saint of the Romish Calendar. By Charles Kingsley, Jun., Rector of Eversley; with a Preface by Professor Maurice, 378.

Kitto—Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature, abridged. By John Kitto, D.D., 213.

Lamb—Hebrew Characters derived from Hieroglyphics. The Original Pictures applied to the Interpretation of various Words of the Sacred Scriptures. By John Lamb, D.D., Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 272.

Last Sleep of a Christian Child, the, 463.

Leicestershire Words, Phrases, and Proverbs. Collected by Arthur B. Evans, D.D., 453.

Lesseps—Ma Mission à Rome. Mai, 1849. *Mémoire présenté au Conseil d'Etat.* Par M. Ferdinand de Lesseps, 344.

Lesseps—Réponse de M. F. de Lesseps au Ministre et au Conseil d'Etat, Août, 1849, 344.

Letters to a Lady. By the Baron Wilhelm von Humboldt, from the German, 449.

Lord's Day, Duty of Keeping the; and the Manner in which it should be kept. By the Rev. Richard Harvey, 473.

Lowe—The "Kingdom of God." A Sermon. By the Rev. T. Lowe, 474.

Ma Mission à Rome. Mai, 1849. *Mémoire présenté au Conseil d'Etat.* Par M. Ferdinand de Lesseps, 344.

Macaulay's Character of the Clergy. By C. Babington, M.A., 474.

McHale—Correspondence between Dr. Mc Hale and the Poor Law Commissioners of Ireland, on the Chaplaincy of the Tuam Workhouse. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 441.

Magazine for the Young, 473.

Magnay—The Rest: an Episode of the Village of Ross Cray. By the Rev. Claude Magnay, 464.

Maitland—Essays on Subjects connected with the Reformation in England. Reprinted from the British Magazine. By the Rev. S. R. Maitland, D.D., 66.

Mangin—Outline of the Constitution and

History of the Church, in Question and Answer. By the Rev. S. W. Mangin, 433.

Manning—Archdeacon Manning's Charge on Education, 474.

Marshall—The Holy Eucharist. By the Rev. J. Marshall, 474.

Maskell—An Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Church of England on Absolution. By the Rev. W. Maskell, 196.

Maurice—The Saint's Tragedy; or, the True Story of Elizabeth of Hungary. By Charles Kingsley, Jun., Rector of Eversley; with a Preface by Professor Maurice, 378.

Medical Student, the Calling of a. By the Rev. G. W. Plumptre, 474.

Merewether—Letter to C. W. Packe, Esq., on the Desirableness and Necessity of a Church Association in Parliament. By the Rev. F. Merewether, M.A., 474.

Mexican War, a Review of the, on Christian Principles. By the Rev. Philip Berry, A.B., 478.

Michell—Ruins of Many Lands. A Descriptive Poem. By Nicholas Michell, 472.

Mill—The Christian Advocate for 1840 *and* 1841. By Rev. W. H. Mill, D.D., 281.

Ministerial Office, Sermon on the. By the Rev. R. S. Savage, 474.

Miscellaneous Subjects, Addresses on. By the Rev. J. S. M. Anderson, M.A., 222.

Modern Housewife, the; or, Menagère; comprising One Thousand Receipts for every Meal of the Day. By Alexis Soyer, 452.

Moral Tales. By the Author of "Hymns for Little Children," 462.

Mount Gerbal the True Mount Sinai, Remarks on. By J. Hogg, Esq. 473.

Marryatt—"Valeric;" an Autobiography. By Captain Marryatt, R.N., 218.

Muir. Report to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, by their Committee for the Suppression of Intemperance. Given in and read by the Rev. Robert Muir, 458.

Nation, the. The Church and the University of Oxford. Two Sermons, preached before the University of Oxford. By William Sewell, B.D., 473.

Natural History of Quadrupeds and Birds, a Popular. By John Dowling, 221.

Nature. An Essay. By R. W. Emerson, 139.

Nature, Short Conclusions from the Light of, 466.

Nemesis of Faith, the. By J. A. Froude, M.A., 464.

Newell—Memoir of a Sunday Scholar. By Rev. A. D. Newell, 474.

New Testament, an Introduction to the; an Examination of the most Important Questions relating to the Authority, Interpretation, and Integrity of the Canonical Books. By Samuel Davidson, LL.D., 466.

New Testament, Greek-English Lexicon of the. By the Rev. T. S. Green, 473.

Newton—Antichrist. A Poem; with Notes and Sketches of Oriental Scenes. By the Rev. H. Newton, 468.

Newton—The Flight of the Apostate. A Poem in three Parts. With Thoughts on our present Pre-Millennial State. By the Rev. H. Newton, 468.

Normal Schools for Training Masters for Workhouse Schools, Minutes of the Committee of Council on. Printed for the House of Commons, 107.

Norris—Ten School-room Addresses. By J. P. Norris, M.A., 473.

Ode—Commentarius de Angelis. By Ode, 281.

Ordination Sermon. By the Rev. C. S. Kennaway, 474.

Palmer—An Appeal to the Scottish Bishops and Clergy, and generally to the Church of their Communion. By the Rev. W. Palmer, 288.

Palmer—Attack on the Appeal of the Rev. W. Palmer to the Scottish Church, 474.

Parish Schoolmaster, a Few Words to a, 57.

Pastor of Welbourn, the, and his Flock, 464.

Peile—Annotations on St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians, Galatians, and Colossians, designed chiefly for the use of Students of the Greek Text. By Thomas Williamson Peile, D.D., 486.

Percy—Romanism as it exists at Rome. By the Hon. J. W. Percy, 472.

Plumptre—The Calling of a Medical Student. Four Sermons. By the Rev. E. W. Plumptre, 474.

Poole—A History of Ecclesiastical Architecture in England. By George Ayliffe Poole, M.A., Vicar of Welford, 464.

Post Office Agitation, a Letter on the late. By C. J. Vaughan, D.D., 473.

Prichard—The Life and Times of Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims. By the late Rev. James C. Prichard, M.A., 212.

Prime, the Order for, 436.
Prince Rupert and the Cavaliers, Memoirs of, including their Private Correspondence; now first published. By Eliot Warburton, 1.
Prophecy—Fourth Series of Lectures on Subjects connected with. Preached by the Rev. James Kelly, M.A., 456.
Prophetic Outlines of the Christian Church and the Antichristian Power, as traced in the Visions of Daniel and St. John. By Archdeacon Harrison, 466.
Protestantism, Developments of, and other Fragments; reprinted from the "Dublin Review" and "Tablet," 452.
Protestant Principles, a Vindication of. By Phileleutherus Anglicanus, 278.
Public Prayer. Sermon. By the Rev. J. G. Shepherd, 474.

Ramsay—Life and Literary Remains of Barbara Hofland. By Thomas Ramsay, 455.
Ranke—Memoirs of the House of Brandenburg, and History of Prussia during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. By Leopold Ranke. Translated from the German by Sir Alexander and Lady Duff Gordon, 395.
Reflections, Meditations, and Prayers (with Gospel Harmony), on the most Holy Life and Sacred Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, 456.
Reformation in England, Essays on Subjects connected with the. Reprinted from the "British Magazine." By the Rev. S. R. Maitland, D.D., 65.
Reformation of the Anglican Church, the, and Mr. Macaulay's History of England. By E. C. Harington, A.M., Chancellor of the Cathedral Church of Exeter, 209.
Romanism as it exists at Rome. By the Hon. J. W. Percy, 472.
Rome, a Pilgrimage to. By the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour, M.A., 322.
Rome, Correspondence respecting the Affairs of. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty, Jan., 1849, 344.
Ruskin—The Seven Lamps of Architecture; with Illustrations drawn and etched by the Author. By John Ruskin, 221.
Russell—The Ancient Knight: or, Chapters on Chivalry. By John Fuller Russell, B.C.L., 222.
Ruins of Many Lands. A Descriptive Poem. By Nicholas Michell, 472.

Sacred Lyrics. By J. R. Smith, 374.
Saint Catherine of Alexandria, an Historical Enquiry touching; to which is added a Semi-Saxon Legend. By Charles Hardwick, M.A., 212.
Saint's Tragedy, the; or, The true Story of Elizabeth of Hungary, Landgravine of Thuringia, Saint of the Romish Calendar. By Charles Kingsley, Jun., Rector of Eversley, with a Preface, by Professor Maurice, 378.
Savage—Sermon on the Ministerial Office. By Rev. R. S. Savage, 474.
Schools of Parochial Unions. Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education, 1847-8-9. *England and Wales*, 107.
Schoolroom Addresses, Ten. By J. P. Norris, M.A., 473.
Scotland, Descriptive Notices of some of the Ancient Parochial and Collegiate Churches of Scotland, 211.
Scottish Bishops and Clergy, an Appeal to the, and generally to the Church of their Communion. By the Rev. W. Palmer, 288.
Scripture Symbolism; or, Tabernacle Architecture. By the Rev. Samuel Garratt, 456.
Sepulchral Slabs and Crosses of the Middle Ages, Manual for the Study of. By the Rev. Edward L. Cutts, 472.
Sermons on the Day of Prayer and the Day of Thanksgiving. By the Rev. J. Jackson, 474.
Sermons preached on Various Occasions, before the University of Oxford. By the Rev. H. B. Williams, M.A., 453.
Seven Ages of the Church, the; or, the Seven Apocalyptic Epistles interpreted by Church History. By the Rev. Henry Cotterill, M.A., 448.
Seven Lamps of Architecture, the. With Illustrations drawn and etched by the Author. By John Ruskin, 221.
Sewell—The Nation, the Church, and the University of Oxford. Two Sermons preached before the University of Oxford. By William Sewell, B.D., 473.
Seymour—A Pilgrimage to Rome. By the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour, M.A., 322.
Seymour—Mornings amongst the Jesuits at Rome. By the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour, 30.
Shepherd—Public Prayer. Sermon. By Rev. J. G. Shepherd, 474.
Sherlock—The Practical Christian; or, the Devout Penitent. By R. Sherlock, D.D. *With a Life of the Author*, by Bishop Wilson. Edited by the Rev. Harold Sherlock, M.A., 456.

Simrock—" Good Gerard of Cologne," a Tale. By Karl Simrock, 216.
Sinfulness of Little Sins, the. Course of Sermons preached in Lent. By John Jackson, M.A., Rector of St. James's, Westminster, 447.
Sharpe's London Magazine, 463.
Smith—Sacred Lyrics. By J. R. Smith, 473.
Smith—The Devout Christian, Thoughts on his Vocation, and a Manual of Devotions for his Use. By Thomas Frederick Smith, M.A., 465.
Soyer—The Modern Housewife, or Menagère. By Alexis Soyer, 452.
Spain, History of, for Young Persons. By the Rev. B. G. Johns, M.A., 463.
Special Grace, a Solemn Warning against the Doctrine of, which causes Divisions in the Church, and prepares the way for Infidelity. By the Rev. W. B. Barter, 220.
Stock-Exchange, Chronicles and Characters of the. By John Francis, 454.
Summer-time in the Country, a Journal of. By the Rev. Robert Aris Willmott, 206.
Sunday Scholar, Memoir of a. By Rev. A. D. Newell, 474.
Sunset Reverie, a; an Allegory, 432.
Superficial Knowledge, the Danger of. Introductory Lecture to a Course of Natural Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh. By James D. Forbes, Esq., 465.
Swedenborg—Remarks on Noble's Appeal in behalf of the Doctrine of, 474.
Swift—The closing Years of Dean Swift's Life, with remarks on Stella. By W. R. Wilde, M.R.I.A., 451.

Ten Commandments, the. By the Author of "Hymns and Scenes of Childhood," 476.
Topography of England, Ecclesiastical and Architectural. Published under the sanction of the Central Committee of the Archæological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, 211.
The Rest. An Episode of the Village of Ross Cray. By the Rev. Claude Magnay, 464.
The Theologian and Ecclesiastic, 471.
Thorpe—Plain Truths on Important Subjects. By the Rev. W. Thorpe, D.D., 456.
Trevilian—A Letter on the Antichristian Character of Freemasonry, to the Rev. W. Carwithen, D.D. By M. C. Trevilian, Esq., 458.

Use and Abuse. A Tale. By a Seven Years' Resident in Greece, 209.

Valeric. An Autobiography. By Captain Marryatt, R.N., 218.
Vaughan—Letter on the late Post Office Agitation. By C. J. Vaughan, D.D., 473.
Vindication of Protestant Principles. By Phileleutherus Anglicanus, 272.
Vores—" The Judgment of Charity." By the Rev. T. Vores, 474.

Warburton—Memoirs of Prince Rupert and the Cavaliers, including their Private Correspondence, now first published. By Eliot Warburton, 1.
Warburton—The Conquest of Canada. By the Author of Hochelaga, 153.
Wesley—A few Words on Cathedral Music and the Musical System of the Church; with a Plan of Reform. By Samuel Sebastian Wesley, 88.
Westminster Abbey. By O. Howell, 473.
Whately, Archbishop, his Charge on Education, 474.
Whiston—Cathedral Trusts and their fulfilment. By the Rev. Robert Whiston, M.A., Head Master of the Cathedral Grammar School, Rochester, 88.
Wilde—The closing Years of Dean Swift's Life; with Remarks on Stella. By W. R. Wilde, M.R.I.A., 451.
Williams—Seven Sermons preached on Various Occasions before the University of Oxford. By the Rev. H. B. Williams, M.A., 458.
Williams—the Holy City. Historical, Topographical, and Antiquarian Notices of Jerusalem. By George Williams, B.D. Second Edition, with Additions, including an *Architectural History of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.* By the Rev. R. Willis, M.A., 171.
Willmott—A Journal of Summer-time in the Country. By the Rev. Robert Aris Willmott, 206.
Wilson—The Practical Christian; or, the Devout Penitent. By R. Sherlock, D.D. *With a Life of the Author*, by Bishop Wilson. Edited by the Rev. Harold Sherlock, M.A., 456.
Winer — Biblisches Realwörterbuch zum Handgebrauch für Studirende, Candidaten, Gymnasiallehrer und Prediger, ausgearbeitet von Dr. Georg Benedict Winer, 272.

THE

ENGLISH REVIEW.

SEPTEMBER, 1849.

ART. I.—*Memoirs of Prince Rupert and the Cavaliers, including their private Correspondence, now first published from the Original Manuscripts. By* ELIOT WARBURTON, *Author of "The Crescent and the Cross."* 3 vols. London: Richard Bentley. 1849.

A THEME of abiding interest, ever kindling the strongest sympathies and awakening the most ardent controversies, is that of our great Civil War. Of all wars it is that, perhaps, which comes most *home* to us, and the memory of which is still calculated most keenly to excite our passions. Yet, whilst proclaiming this, we are far from maintaining or avowing that that terrible domestic conflict has wrought any very lasting effects among us, or that we are justified in attributing the freedom of our constitution, or the stability of its wisest institutions, to that ill-starred Rebellion which swept like the blast of the Sahara over the fertile glades of England, blighting the promise of a genial summertide, and at last passed from the face of earth, leaving, however, the old sound genial soil behind it, where the old world of order and beauty in due time bloomed again and ripened toward the harvest. We are intimately persuaded that the only real effect of the Great Rebellion was to *retard* the genuine development of our constitution in Crown, Lords, and Commons, as at present possessed by us, for the better part of a century, and at the same time to set the example of stubborn and lawless disobedience to "the powers that be," to be followed in other lands and other times by still more deluded and suicidal nations, impelled on their course by more unprincipled demagogues—men, without that fire of puritanic zeal, however misdirected, which serves in some degree to modify our condemnation of the worst of Roundhead excesses. Seriously, we believe, that our constitution, as at present possessed by us, was gradually, yet surely, developing throughout the reigns of Elizabeth and James the First; so that the royal martyr, on coming to his throne, was prepared, and even anxious, to recognise that element of power which was already embodied in his Commons, though he was also resolved not to allow that one branch of the legislature to overrule and absorb both the others, and thus concentrate power in one despotic middle-class majority.

We need not here record the pertinacity in unreasonable disloyalty, (we cannot employ a milder term,) which characterized the first parliaments of Charles's reign,—at least, the houses of

Commons in each Parliament. Almost all historians of credit are agreed upon this head. We may safely leave Mr. Macaulay's opinions on one side in discussing this question; for so bitter is his animosity to the royal martyr, that he almost appears to lose his reason when approaching the subject, and actually condescends to furbish up anew every absurd calumny ever forged by puritanic rancour, for the delectation of his liberal and enlightened readers of the nineteenth century. We repeat, that by the concurrent testimonies of all dispassionate historians, not only Hume and Disraeli, but even Guizot and Hallam,—why should we not add Miss Strickland?—the first houses of Commons in Charles's reign have been convicted of most unreasonable, and we may add, up to that period totally unprecedented, disaffection to their youthful sovereign. They refused to vote money for wars to which they themselves had urged the last monarch; they made the most violent attacks on the first ministers of state, and finally showed a strong disposition to revolutionize the Church, if possible, and remodel its faith and ceremonies after the fashion of Calvinistic Geneva.

No doubt, many readers may here feel inclined to exclaim with some degree of surprise, "But why was the Church thus powerless in her country's halls of legislation? Did this puritanic spirit of disaffection prevail so generally that the monarch was *compelled* to exert this severe repressive influence in order to keep the spirit of democracy in Church and State within due bounds?" The correct answer to this question may appear self-contradictory: the Puritan party, though not inconsiderable in numbers, still constituted but a small minority, when contrasted with the whole body of the English nation; and yet, in the country's legislature, its influence was all but supreme. How did this arise? Truly, from the very same cause for which we have reason to apprehend the possible spoliation of the Church, and ruin of the State, even in this our day. Then, as now, certain active, turbulent, audacious spirits were prominent in the ranks of disloyalty and disaffection,—men corresponding but too faithfully to our present Brights and Cobdens; then, as now, the standard-bearers of Church and State were deficient in genius, energy, and moral courage—were wanting to themselves and their cause. In the days of Charles the First, he, the king, stood for a long time alone, or worse than alone; even Strafford, when he became his friend, was probably more calculated to injure than advance his cause, every thing he advised or performed being in the highest degree stern, unconciliatory, and unpopular. Laud also, though an admirable Churchman after his fashion, was the very worst of supporters, being endowed with such an overbearing manner and

with so petulant a temper as constantly to irritate his best wishers, and thus effect, despite his good intentions, a very "world of harm." Buckingham, also, was an unfortunate legacy bequeathed to the young monarch by his dying father, and of course not to be cast off, like an old cloke, at any moment; though it must be confessed that our more recent historians are inclined to bear much too heavily upon this elegant statesman, whose character has been placed by Clarendon (who knew him well) in a far more favourable light. Still what were these supporters, backed by the irritable and superstitious queen, to the array of talent and audacity brought into the parliamentary field against the unfortunate monarch? Who can wonder that, without a single sufficient exponent of the royal policy in either house, and especially among the Commons, those few active and designing men who pertained to the Puritan phalanx were enabled to win the ears of the majority, and obstruct the business of the State? The king was positively driven to dissolve his parliaments from the lack of constitutional representatives within their halls: not that his cause was monstrous or unjust, as almost all men must now admit, but because talent and resolution were only to be found amongst the foes of royalty and order. Can we wonder that, under such circumstances, King Charles should have recourse to almost forgotten precedents to raise the funds indispensable to the safety of the State, rather than lay himself at the feet of a Puritan faction, which soon found occasion to prove that nothing less would satisfy it than the spoliation and temporal destruction of the Church? It is well to say, that the king should have submitted to the course of events, and allowed Puritanism to triumph, if the Commons so willed, or rather if the audacity of a few demagogues, and the pusillanimity or supineness of the Church's supporters, led (as they must naturally have done) to such a catastrophe. It was not proved at that time—and, we may be permitted to add, it is not proved now—that the royalty of England was nothing but a shadow. It may be urged, indeed, that the king might have reserved the exercise of his royal prerogative to the very last moment when these revolutionary measures had received the assent of both houses, and have then placed his veto upon their execution; but he was well aware that, when puritanism had attained this parliamentary triumph, the temporal doom of the Church would probably be sealed, whatever might be the royal resolution. We cannot therefore wonder at, we cannot find it in our hearts to blame, the monarch, who preferred the having recourse to such a sad expedient as the ship-money, rather than expose his beloved Church to the inveterate fury of her foes.

In the Long Parliament, how wanting were the Church's

sons to their Monarch and to England! For a long time we find Hyde and Falkland co-operating with the fiercest Puritans against their spiritual mother, *leading* the attack even against all the heads of that Church which had endeavoured to repress the rebellious spirit then abroad. And yet what were the real grievances alleged against Laud and his colleagues? The most weighty charge of oppression that has come down to us, and one which liberal historians are never tired of repeating under every possible form, is founded on the just, and, we may even add, moderate, though somewhat barbarous, punishment of those foul-mouthed varlets, Prynne and Bastwick, whose ears were clipped, according to a custom perhaps "better honoured in the breach than the observance;" though, had the liars been bastinadoed through every market-town in Great Britain for their insolent calumnies, they would only have received their due. Prynne subsequently confessed as much in terms of self-abhorrence: and yet these men are "the innocent victims of tyranny and martyrs of the Gospel," enshrined by some of our contemporaries in their British Gallery of Worthies, among the Hampdens and Cromwells, who are, truly, worthy of such companionship!—However this might be, those, who were subsequently loyalty's leaders joined in the first lawless outcry against Church and State, and abetted the audacity of a Pym and the cunning of a Hampden. Finally, it is true, that these men, Hyde and Falkland, in some degree redeemed the past by maintaining the cause of order, though then only faintly and partially. Falkland, be it remembered, (a man who has been immensely overrated by all parties,) voted even for the expulsion of the bishops from the Upper House,—a measure eventually carried through Cavalier cowardice alone.

There is one circumstance, too, which seems to be generally forgotten, and which is, nevertheless, proved by the pages of Clarendon, though it tells much against himself, which we must not leave unnoticed. When the king was at last induced to make those who had trampled upon his counsellors, and cast his beloved friend Laud into the Tower, his new ministers of state,—when he had received the firmest assurances from both Hyde and Falkland that they would in future endeavour firmly to maintain the cause of order and true freedom,—he on his part replied to their assurances by an obviously as conditional assurance, that he would in future undertake no great measure without consulting them. About a week or ten days after this, the bishops, being fiercely beset by Puritan mobs on their passage to the House of Lords, pray for a guard of honour, and, this being refused them, declare that it is in that case impossible for them to attend to

their parliamentary duties, and so protest against the House's proceeding without them. For this *offence* they were actually arraigned for high treason—and, will it be credited?—in that very house, in which sat Hyde and Falkland, those true friends of the King and the Church, those wise and faithful counsellors, the only voice raised against the committal of the bishops to the Tower, was that of one unknown member (perhaps the brave Sir Ralph Hopton), who, says Clarendon, had the courage to affirm, "he did not believe them guilty of high treason, but that they were stark mad, and he therefore desired they might be sent to Bedlam." After this, is it not really astounding that historians should affect wonder at the king's having ceased to place confidence in men who had been guilty, as Hyde and Falkland had been on this occasion, of such utterly despicable moral cowardice? Can we wonder that he should have resolved, not through the influence of Digby, but urged by his own royal and indignant soul, to interpose in defence of the insulted and degraded Church and State, and arrest the chief offenders? We really cannot find words to express our astonishment at the obstinacy with which writer after writer, treating of this period, *will* close his eyes to the facts of the case, and assume that the king was either guilty of an unjustifiable breach of trust towards such friends of the Church as Hyde and Falkland, or of absurd apprehensions of the revolutionary progress of events, in this his royal and constitutional attempt to bring the five members to trial before a jury of their fellow-countrymen. There cannot be a doubt that no men ever before or since have urged such insolent and revolutionary language within our halls of legislature as these men had been guilty of on principle and for a long season. Yet Clarendon even has the audacity to suggest, that the cause of order was rapidly progressing at this very moment in the House of Commons, where he and Falkland did not dare to open their lips in behalf of the thus scandalously oppressed heads of their Church, oppressed, nay, condemned to an imprisonment which lasted for years for a temperate and extremely natural protestation. The truth is, that the eyes of Churchmen have been hoodwinked on this subject by the account Clarendon has given of the business, who, of course, did his utmost to make out a case for himself and excuse his inexcusable pusillanimity, and who consequently abuses the bishops for their "excessive folly and daring," and almost ventures to approve of their immurement for their "crime."

We will not here trace further the progress of events. What we have said may have sufficed to show, that throughout the whole parliamentary struggle King Charles stood virtually alone, the friends of order and the Church in either house being for a long

time cowardly or lukewarm, and never opposing a fitting front to the encroachments of their Puritanic adversaries. From the breaking out of the war to the termination of the royal career, slander itself has devised but few charges against King Charles's memory, though here too some cases of imaginary faithlessness have been discovered by the industry of certain modern historians. However, during this latter eventful period the deportment of our royal martyr will generally speak for itself. It is on the earlier portion of his career that his foes bend their arrows most spitefully; and it is with regard to this that his friends too often desert his cause, yielding with a moral cowardice, akin to that of Hyde of old, to the noisy and factious cries of his malignant adversaries. On this account, too, we have not been able to deny ourselves the satisfaction of tracing this very hasty summary of those earlier years, and correcting certain vulgar errors, which seem to spring forth anew, "ill weeds that grow apace," however carefully the honest inquirer may fancy he has rooted them from the soil.

Mr. Eliot Warburton, the author of "The Crescent and the Cross," in the highly praiseworthy work before us, has rendered himself obnoxious to certain of our sweeping charges anent faint-heartedness in the supporters of the cause of royalty. He professes to abjure all partisanship; yet one side or other a writer must needs take in the treatment of such a theme, and it is very obvious that Mr. Warburton's *heart*, at least, is with the Cavaliers, from the beginning to the end. Nevertheless, whilst lauding and loving the martyr monarch, he joins, though apparently unwillingly, in some of the ancient calumnies against him; twits him with insincerity, though with marvellous little foundation for the charge; suspects him of designs upon the liberties of England, certainly without being borne out in his suspicions by the real facts of the case; and finally, from time to time, assumes a tone of superior pity, which ill befits any Churchman who treats of the fortunes of the Royal Martyr. Mr. Warburton—we are sorry to bring such an accusation, but the truth must be told—is inclined to yield far too much authority to the current of opinions of the present hour. Thus, for instance, not contented with blackening the memory of the greatest, take her for all in all, of English sovereigns, Queen Elizabeth, he follows Miss Strickland in drawing the most unjustifiable and cruel conclusions from that touching picture of her dying hour, which has been left us by her godson Harrington, who loved and honoured her so sincerely, and who little imagined that he was sharpening a barb for the quiver of calumny, when he recorded in simple words, which might well draw tears from gentle eyes, how his royal mis-

tress humbly sought for the intercession of the Church's representative[1], that beloved and aged man, who knelt beside her couch, and who offered up his prayers for her departing spirit to the great Lord and Saviour of queen and beggar; how she herself lay patiently, her hands clasped, her eyes upraised to Heaven, until her soul departed from its earthly tabernacle. It is extraordinary, that a record of this nature, written in sincere affection, should have been converted to such a purpose; but such is the cry of the hour, and, alas! Mr. Warburton has not failed to swell it. Thus, too, he falls in with the usual commonplace eulogiums of Hampden and Falkland; though Clarendon in his own days, and Southey since then, in the pages of the 'Quarterly,' have so thoroughly demonstrated the duplicity and ambition of the former traitor, and the vacillating temper and very inferior mental faculties of the latter must be apparent to the dispassionate inquirer, who will take the trouble to think for himself upon the subject. By the bye, we may be permitted to observe, that the portrait of Falkland, which Mr. Warburton has given us in his present work, should convince the admirers of that weak though well-meaning man, that he was not "the angel" they conceive him. To us, at least, there appears a degree of vulgarity in his countenance, which is inconsistent with mental greatness, and only partially redeemed by the equally incontestable presence of good temper and physical courage. However, opinions may differ as to physiognomy, and we therefore will not waste more words upon this subject.

As yet we have said nothing of Mr. Warburton's more immediate hero, Prince Rupert, having been naturally drawn aside in the first instance by the memory of that royal and saintly countenance, of which Mr. Warburton himself speaks so feelingly, as awakening his first heart's love even in his childish years. Let us now turn to the work before us, and pursue its progress cursorily, but with some attention, culling a few brilliant extracts to enliven our graver pages. The preface is modest and gentlemanly. In it Mr. Warburton says with truth of his princely hero, that "no person, perhaps, *except his royal master*, was ever more exposed to calumny, or less defended." Why did not Mr. Warburton keep this fact more strictly in view in the course of his subsequent biography? The account given of his authorities is extremely satisfactory, and attention is very naturally called to the important "Benett Collection," the main source of whatever "new lights" Mr. Warburton has afforded us. The introductory chapter ensuing is well and clearly written, but throughout with too apparent a tendency to please all parties, and to

[1] The Archbishop of Canterbury.

avoid the imputation of "cavaliership." Mr. Warburton's first sentence is characteristic. "The cause of the Cavaliers," he says, "was once the cause of half the men of England." (We should rather say of five-sixths of them.) "Fortunately for us, that cause was unsuccessful, yet not altogether lost: shorn by the parliament's keen sword of the despotic and false principle that disgraced it, its nobler and better elements survived, imparting firmer strength and a loftier tone to our constitution." Now here we must distinctly deny that any absolute principle, beyond the maintenance of order according to the established forms of Church and State, was held either by King Charles or his supporters generally. Mr. Warburton probably alludes to the unrestricted exercise of the royal prerogative; and this is, undoubtedly, too important a question to enter upon here parenthetically,—yet so much we may say: the king did not resolve on having recourse to arms until a mutinous minority of the Commons, which had illegally declared their house incapable of dissolution, had usurped all power, and called on the sovereign to resign even the semblance of authority into their "loyal hands." Is Mr. Warburton of opinion that the crown ought not to be one of the three branches of the legislature? If not, then let him read King Charles's own proclamations and declarations, undoubtedly penned by his own royal hands on the breaking out of the civil war, wherein he will find the nature of the British Constitution as well, if not better, expounded than it ever has been before or since. "Is," asked the indignant monarch, "the dignity, privilege, and freedom of Parliament (Parliament, whose wisdom and gravity have prepared so many wholesome laws, and whose freedom distinguishes the condition of our subjects from those of any monarchy in Europe) precious unto our people? Where was that freedom, and that privilege, when the House of Commons presumed to make laws without the House of Peers, as they did in their vote upon the protestation?" &c. &c. And again: "It is evident that no man can be moved with it (the Puritans' accusation), who doth not believe a dozen or twenty factious, seditious persons to be the High Court of Parliament, which consists of King, lords, and commons. And for the privileges of it (Parliament), whoever doth *not* believe, that to raise an army to murder or depose the King, to alter the whole frame of government and established laws of the lands, by extemporary extravagant votes of and resolutions of either or both houses, to force and compel the members to submit to the faction and treason of a few, and to take away the liberty and freedom of consultation from them,—*he* the privileges of Parliament,—*he* must confess that the army now raised by us is no less for the vindication and preservation of Parliaments than for our own

necessary defence. We have often said, and we still say, that we believe many inconveniences have grown upon this kingdom by the too long intermission of parliaments; that parliaments are the only necessary sovereign remedies of the growing mischiefs which time and accidents have and will always beget in this kingdom; that without parliaments the happiness cannot be lasting to king or people. We have prepared for the frequent assembling of parliaments, and will be always as careful of their just privileges, as of our life, honour, or interest." And here we may take occasion to remark, how much two works are wanted to do full justice to the memory of the royal martyr: the one, a popular modern reprint of that magnificent old folio volume, entitled—"ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΑ, or, The Works of King Charles the Martyr, with a collection of Declarations, Treaties, and other Papers concerning the Differences betwixt his said Majesty and his two Houses of Parliament. London: Printed by James Flesher for R. Keyston, Bookseller to his most Sacred Majesty, 1672,"—which contains an interesting biography of the royal saint; the beautiful Eicon Basilike; the extremely valuable controversies betwixt King Charles and the chief Puritan preachers on Church government, in which his majesty displayed intellectual powers of the very highest order; a collection of prayers composed by this royal sufferer in affliction; his majesty's messages; his masterly declarations, which contain much of the most animated and noble writing we are acquainted with; his letters, on which such false and scurrilous charges have been founded, and which reflect his royal innocence as in a spotless mirror, his speeches, &c., &c. Secondly, we desiderate a work corresponding in some sense with Carlyle's recent Life of Cromwell, in which that usurper has been made to write in part his own biography; the vivid and picturesque "filling up," supplying scenery and colouring, being added by his idolatrous admirer. Some such "labour of love," we say, should be undertaken for King Charles; but it must not be weakly or pusillanimously executed. Rather give us a wild enthusiast, or even *would-be* enthusiast, such as Carlyle himself, (for we cannot quite believe in the contortions of that gentleman's zeal,) than a cold, cautious, cowardly scribe, a "*candid* friend," ready to make every possible admission against the man whose life he has undertaken to illustrate, and yielding to every blast of vulgar and popular delusion.

But, to return from this digression to our author and his immediate theme, he takes a far more favourable view of the present aspect of affairs than we are inclined to do, considering the cause of loyalty to be now permanently the cause of all, peo-

ple and peer, and feeling little apprehension of democratic turbulence. We are heartily willing to join with him in commending all those, whether landlords or manufacturers, who serve their country, by making their tenantry or their labourers their true friends; but, alas! though the surge of popular disaffection may have seemed for a moment to recede, we fear that it is only gathering fresh strength to sweep once more in fury against our ancient bulwarks! May those bulwarks never fall! But, if they are not to fall, they must be manned by *bold* and *resolute* defenders.

Mr. Warburton's narrative of Prince Rupert's youth displays no little talent for the effective grouping of historical events. The coronation of his father Frederic at Prague is graphically portrayed. The early fortunes of Rupert, displaying from the first that spirit of bold and happy daring which more than rivalled the valour of mediæval chivalry, are pleasantly and naturally "dashed off." His temporary confinement at Lintz, and especially his "love-passages" with Madlle de Kuffstein are delineated in a vein of happy and unforced "prose-poetry." Finally, we accompany Rupert to England, and at this period he is thus aptly painted by his faithful biographer:—

"Prince Rupert was now nearly twenty-three. His portrait presents to us the ideal of a gallant Cavalier. His figure, tall, vigorous, and symmetrical, would have been somewhat stately but for its graceful bearing and noble ease. A vehement yet firm character predominates in the countenance, combined with a certain gentleness, apparent only in the thoughtful but not pensive eyes. Large, dark, and well-formed eyebrows overarch a high-bred Norman nose; the upper lip is finely cut, but somewhat supercilious in expression; the lower part of the mouth and chin have a very different meaning, and impart a tone of iron resolution to the whole countenance. Long-flowing hair (through which, doubtless, curled the romantic "love-lock") flowed over the wide embroidered collar, or the scarlet cloak: he wore neither beard nor moustaches, then almost universal; and his cheek, though bronzed by exposure, was marked by a womanly dimple. On the whole, our Cavalier must have presented an appearance as attractive in a lady's eye, and as unlovely in a Puritan's, as Vandyke ever immortalised. Such was the aspect of the young Palatine, who won for himself a name so renowned in the tradition of our civil wars, yet so uncertain in their history."

We shall proceed, though the passage be rather long, to extract the next two or three pages of the narrative, so characteristic are they of Mr. Warburton's ease and grace of narration, as also of his *impartiality*.

"He (the prince) is now riding side by side with his royal kinsman to Nottingham, on the way to the opening scene of the great tragedy. By the aid of old writings, and still more by the aid of old prints and pictures, we may bring the group of warlike travellers before our eyes, and behold the scenes they saw. A strong wind was sweeping over the wide valley of the Trent, then uninclosed by fences, and only marked at wide intervals by some low strong farm-houses, with innumerable gables. In the distance, boldly relieved against the stormy sky, rose the stern old castle of Nottingham; a flag-staff, as yet innocent of the *fatal standard*, was visible on its highest tower. Long peace and security had invested the country round with a very different aspect from that which Rupert had lately seen in Germany. A prosperous peasantry were gathering in a plentiful harvest. There were no symptoms any where of the approaching war, until the royal cavalcade passed by.—The greater part of the prince's cavalry was there, endeavouring to make an imposing appearance; but they were scantily furnished with the basnet (or steel cap), and the back and breastplate over leather doublet, that then formed the essential harness of a trooper; for arms, they had nothing but their swords. The equipment of their king and their young general was almost as simple: the plumed hat of the time was only laid aside on the day of battle, and not always then by the reckless Rupert; a short cloak (the prince's was of scarlet cloth), and large cavalry boots, almost enveloped the remainder of the person; a slender train of heralds and poursuivants, and some gentlemen-at-arms, complete the cavalcade. Such was the royal progress to the head-quarters of the Cavaliers.

"Never had the king's destiny appeared so dark. On the preceding day Coventry had closed her gates against him, and fired upon his flag; Leicester was only held to his cause by Wilmot's cavalry; his appeal to his people had been hitherto made in vain. Some few of the chief Cavaliers, indeed, had obeyed his summons; but the peasants, the yeomen, and even the soldiers of fortune still stood aloof, or looked wistfully towards the parliament. Nottingham as yet afforded a rallying point for his few adherents, and a shelter to his council; but the very country he was passing through was hostile, and the high sheriff Digby could scarcely assemble sufficient 'trainbands' to furnish the appearance of a royal guard. Yet the day was come, the eventful day appointed for the Raising of the Standard, and Charles did not hesitate in his purpose. His character henceforth displayed far more firmness than hitherto: his better nature, although reserved, was dauntless, enduring, and even sanguine. He believed himself to be an injured and outraged king, and that he was about to appeal most righteously to the God of Battles.

"Meanwhile the little town of Nottingham was filled with thousands of curious spectators from the country round about. The day passed on without tidings of the king, or any tokens of the approaching ceremony, only that from time to time some Cavaliers arrived, their armour and gay caparison dimmed and disfigured by the storm. The

foremost of these devoted men had already bidden a long farewell to the homes, now desolate, yet glorying in their departure.

"At length the royal banner was seen advancing across the plain. As the king drew near, a profound melancholy was observed upon his countenance: *Hyde and his brother counsellors of peace* watched it anxiously, but were soon disabused of the hope that such sadness betokened any altered purpose. The council immediately assembled in the dilapidated hall of the old castle, and the king's determination was declared by his own lips, *in such terms as precluded all remonstrance.* The standard was to be raised forthwith—that irrevocable challenge to a powerful *people* (?) in their wrath! and the challenger was a powerless king, without troops, revenue, or apparent resources. His only hope lay in the national loyalty he had once *so severely tried,* and in the chivalry of the few faithful Cavaliers who then surrounded him.

"All matter of debate was now postponed, and the king proceeded to the momentous ceremony of the day. At once the fatal standard was unfurled from a high eminence within the park, its broad folds waving over the warlike group below. The king stood upon a grassy knoll: a herald by his side then read the proclamation with a voice almost inaudible in the storm; but that officer had scarcely begun, when the king, *with characteristic indecision,* took the paper from his hand, and made such alterations that the herald blundered inauspiciously through the remainder of his task. The few spectators shouted 'God save the King!' and night coming on put an end to the dismal ceremony.

"The next morning no standard was to be seen. It had been blown down during the night. The king ordered it to be removed to a commanding station in the park, observing, that 'before it looked as if imprisoned!' But a fatality seemed still to attend upon that standard. The ground was so hard that the heralds were obliged to use their daggers in order to plant it in the unwilling soil, and even then four men were compelled to support it through the ceremony. Again the proclamation was read, and for four successive days the broad standard of England streamed out upon an unceasing storm, with the blood-red battle-flag above.

"The signal caught the eye of many a group of gallant men, who were then advancing across the valley to join that standard and to live or die beneath its shadow. Few they were, but they represented tens of thousands who lingered in blessed peace among their homes as long as peace was possible, yet started forth in battle-armour as soon as the summons of the trumpet reached them. Their hearts might not be all at ease as to the clear justice of their cause, but it seemed, doubtless, the less evil alternative: old and honourable prejudices, ancient associations, chivalrous honour, reckless and desperate loyalty drew them to their king. How mournful that such devotion should have been so tried—and so rewarded!"

What the meaning of this last phrase may be, we do not very

well know, but suppose it may convey an allusion to the return of Charles the Second, that unworthy son of the martyr-monarch. But, despite the slight tendency to what we should designate "trimming" discernible in this narrative, it must be confessed that its style is easy and agreeable, and its colouring very picturesque. Would that Mr. Warburton had always sketched his scenes of action as distinctly! Sometimes he appears too hurried, and by haste forfeits effect. An admirable letter follows from "the heroic Sir Beville Grenville," as our author most fitly designates him, the tone of which shows none of those faint-hearted scruples alluded to by Mr. Warburton, which were, we believe, unknown, save to men like Hyde and Falkland, who had been partially infected by long proximity to the miasma of treason and sedition: Sir Beville then wrote to Sir John Trelawny,—"Sir, the barbarous and implacable enemy, notwithstanding his Majesty's gracious proceedings with them, do continue their insolencies and rebellion in the highest degree:" and again, "I can not contain myself within my doors when the King of England's standard waves in the field upon so just occasion,—the cause being such as must make all those who die in it little inferior to martyrs." This was the trumpet-tone of honour, loyalty, and truth, and should awake an echo in every manly breast. Mr. Warburton subjoins, fairly enough, the record of Sir Edmund Varney's doubts and fears, as a kind of "pendant:" Sir Edward "did not like the quarrel." Wherefore? As we might have suspected, "he had no reverence for the bishops for whom this quarrel subsists;" that is, practically speaking, he was half a Puritan.——A chapter follows in which Mr. Warburton has taken a sweeping review of the domestic policy of England. His general views have been already suggested. He says: "I believe that Charles met his first parliament with a sincere desire to conciliate their affection, apart from all interested motives;" but subsequently twits him with "insincerity," on what grounds we are left in ignorance; for our author has taken occasion in more than one instance to prove the groundlessness of the usual charges, especially in as far as the private correspondence with the queen is concerned, taken at Naseby, respecting which Messrs. Carlyle and Macaulay have written such egregious nonsense as to give strong grounds for the suspicion that they have never even looked at the subject-matter of their abuse. Mr. Warburton is very severe upon the king for his desertion of Strafford, perhaps not unjustly: yet he forgets to mention (as do most other historians) that all the king's adherents in the House of Commons, all the bishops, save Juxon, all the ministry even had deserted Strafford first, and that he himself implored death of his royal master,

rather than expose his crown to apparent forfeiture, in a most noble letter, written from the Tower. It is very strange that after this, when howling mobs had surrounded the palace for three days; when the queen, believing her life at stake, knelt ceaselessly before her royal husband; when a revolution seemed imminent; when Strafford demanded martyrdom;—men should be so very forward to twit this holy king with treachery and "betrayal," however *he* might be disposed to regard his own conduct. In after-years, he believed he should have risked all then; should have either rushed upon a civil war, or, if needful, have sacrificed his own life and those of his wife and children, rather than allow the axe to descend on Strafford's head: not that Strafford was altogether guiltless, for he had repeatedly exceeded his powers, and thereby exposed his king to needless odium, but inasmuch as he had proved, on the whole, a good and faithful servant.

"The passionate and irresistible eloquence of the Reformers," as Mr. Warburton calls it, proceeded to murder Archbishop Laud, and incarcerate every body they could lay their hands upon who differed in opinion from themselves on any point whatsoever. After this, it might indeed seem strange, that even a "Varney" should doubt the justice of the royal cause: but the truth is, that such a flood of seditious invectives had been poured forth for the last six years, that all weaker minds and souls were hurried along by these troublous waters. Such is the certain *ultimate* result of fierce and noisy agitation for whatever goal, which is not met at once and coped with in the fitting arena with equal spirit and resolution! Let living Churchmen take warning by this lesson, and, when they see the "moderates" of King Charles's day approving at last of these heights of Puritanic folly and tyranny, let them know, that they are too likely to follow their example, soon or late, if they now listen in silence to the calumnies of a Bright and a Cobden. (We do not see why we should not call things by their right names.) Let the friends of the Church of Ireland, above all, take warning. No tone of apology will serve their turn. Let the insolent invectives of a Roebuck be met, not with faint excuses and faltering appeals to gratitude, *but* with severe reprimands and true-hearted defiance! And here let us record, that we have reason to be thankful to the honourable member for the University of Dublin, Mr. Napier. He at least speaks the truth, and speaks it after an honourable and manly fashion: and, whatever may be the craft of the almost invariably *Roman Catholic* reporters for the Daily Papers, who generally substitute "Catholic" for "Romish," and "Protestant" for "Anglican" or "Churchman," in all church speeches whatsoever, such manly oratory as Mr. Napier's must

make its due impression on the House, and in time upon the public also. We might say as much of Mr. Augustus Stafford; but of late he has been silent on Church subjects, we know not wherefore. We remember an admirable speech of his in defence of the Church of Ireland, delivered some three years ago, which inspired us with the highest hopes. Other friends, too, we have on whom we can count; but once more we repeat it, Let us have no "*candid*" advocacy, no fighting on the retreat! If members cannot speak like men, let them not speak at all!

But to resume. Mr. Warburton bestows the highest praises on Lord Falkland, the very model of modern "Conservatives," halting for ever "betwixt two opinions," with a natural aversion to sound Church principles, which he confounded with Popery; and a strong tendency, common to most mere well-meaning men, to swim with the current of popular opinion, in whatever direction it might chance to set. Nevertheless, he was, we believe, "a gentleman *sans peur et sans reproche:*" and his death made some amends for his early weakness. Peace to his ashes! May our young scions of noble or of gentle blood take heed that they pursue not a similar career! Hyde is also highly praised by Mr. Warburton, not without justice: and thus his third chapter concludes with an animated final strain. The fourth treats of the preliminaries of the war. Here we have a picturesque description of London in the reign of King Charles, which might probably both amuse and edify our readers; but we cannot find space for so lengthy an extract. There is much of the former "blowing hot and cold" in pages 272-3. Mr. Warburton cannot avoid convicting Pym, Hampden, and their *confrères* of cant and tyranny, but he proffers excuses for them, and intimates that King Charles, and most of his ministers, and many of his bishops, had acted "very wickedly;" a sweeping accusation, which is unsupported by the smallest tittle of evidence, and in fact looks like "a sop thrown to Cerberus," a verbal concession to the gentlemen reviewers of "the Athenæum" and "the Examiner," lest those critics should grow uproarious. We earnestly advise the expunging of this and similar phrases from the next edition. They are irreconcilable with other direct assertions made by Mr. Warburton himself. With regard to the "engagement" entered into by the peers and others at York, Mr. Warburton has forgotten to record, that all these Cavaliers, with characteristic moral cowardice, refused to allow the said engagement to be made public, and thereby virtually destroyed the effect of their own deed. Such was, then, the reign of Liberal cant and Conservative pusillanimity. Have we not too much reason to suspect that a similar occasion would to-morrow lead to similar results?

At last, we arrive at the war, and here fiery Rupert begins to shine. He becomes the idol of the young Cavaliers, though the old regard his daring with some apprehension. His first encounter with the Roundheads upon the Pershore road is described with much spirit, the biographer evidently sympathizing with his hero. We have various amusing anecdotes concerning Rupert's sayings and doings, in this part of the first volume, which assist us in obtaining a clearer view of his real character. These are followed by an interesting description of the Cavalier camp, and a noble extract from the royal chaplain's sermon. The Puritans, too, receive their due in various respects, and are shown to have been by no means so pure and holy as their own boastings might lead the credulous to imagine. In the second volume we now arrive at the first great battle, that of Edgehill, painted with no little animation. As we purpose to extract another battle-scene, we shall leave this behind us, contented with our general encomium. Of course, our author does not forget his hero, whose gallant achievements always seem to awaken his enthusiasm. The marches and countermarches ensuing are all narrated with great spirit, and form an attractive picture, though what may now seem *sport* to us was *death* to many honest Englishmen; not that our author's tone is ever flippant, save in one or two short passages anent the king. He writes too much like a gentleman and a Cavalier. "The queen arrives—the war grows hot," is the heading of the next chapter, which contains much interesting matter, especially vindicating the honour and even the gentleness of Prince Rupert, calumniated by Puritan rancour; this task is very satisfactorily performed.

Hampden's death is treated of at length; and a wholly undeserved eulogium is bestowed upon this wicked man, of whom we have some reason, however, to hope that he had made his peace with his Maker before he died, and repented his long course of rancorous treason and detestable hypocrisy. Clarendon knew this individual well: he even acted in concert with him for some years. Why then should he have denounced him as he has done, entering into all the particulars of his odious dissimulation, without just cause? We do not find him speak thus severely of Pym even, nor of Cromwell—in, fact, he was any thing but a violent party-man, and could always see virtues in an enemy. We put it therefore to Mr. Warburton's conscience, whether he can be justified in passing over such damning evidence, with the subsequent judicial condemnation of a Southey, without one word, and treat this rebel, stricken by the hand of his God, and receiving even in this world the meed of his pernicious labours, as little less than a saint or an angel. Look at this man's career from first

to last! What is there in it to excite sympathy or admiration? At first we find him a common-place libertine "about town;" subsequently he adopts Puritan views, and subsides, as is not uncommon in such cases, into extreme and almost ascetic coldness and severity. Then he makes himself conspicuous by *nobly* closing up his pockets and refusing to pay ship-money. This, we suspect, is the real cause for which Britons' hearts so warm towards him. They are always disposed to sympathize with any one who runs a crusade against the king's taxes. At last he enters parliament, pretends to be the most moderate of men, coaxes poor weak Falkland into voting against the bishops, secretly provokes all the most desperate Puritan counsels, finally becomes a party to measures, now condemned on all sides—measures denounced by Mr. Warburton himself, as pregnant with cant and wicked tyranny. Nay, not only was he a party to all this; but he was the prime mover, the main agent. His, and not Pym's, seems to have been the master-mind; at all events he must share the main responsibility with that worthy. And now, after all this;—after the murder of Laud and Strafford; the incarceration of the bishops,—the imprisonment of all true loyalists these rebels could lay their hands upon; the adoption of a now universally execrated policy, which the Whig Hallam can scarcely find words to reprove and condemn, which even Macaulay appears to abandon;—we are told that this man left none behind him of equal genius, integrity, and influence. Where is the shadow of excuse for such a laudation? What *one* noble and generous act is recorded of this man? Of course the criticlings of such organs as the "Athenæum" would sneer at all this as sad bigotry; but facts are stubborn things, and must surely make their way. If there is an instance on record of the display of any generous feeling by this cold-hearted, ambitious Puritan, we entreat that it may be bestowed on us in any future edition of Mr. Warburton's work—something, however small, to set against the flood of overwhelming condemnatory evidence. We know that a certain prejudice exists in very many minds as to Mr. Hampden's apocryphal virtues; we hear of them almost in our cradles, and may be unwilling to resign "the fond delusion." But it is vain to struggle against facts. We cannot receive this man into our National Gallery of Worthies, as the champion of freedom; *he* is her deadliest foe who, in her name, sets loose the dogs of civil war to desolate his native land, and that without the shadow of occasion. Clarendon's final summary of his character in the words of the Roman historian, however strong, seems only too correct: "He had a head to contrive, and a tongue to persuade, and a hand to execute *any mischief!*"

The siege of Bristol, the first battle of Newbury, and the death of Pym are the principal events recorded in the next chapter. Rupert's daring is, as usual, conspicuous. Mr. Warburton's description of this first battle of Newbury is scarcely as spirited as his usual battle-scenes; but no doubt the subject might be less inspiring. Clarendon's commendations of his amiable friend Falkland, who fell here, are cited *con amore*. Pym is dismissed without any very glowing eulogium. It seems that he lost his popularity after Hampden's death, (a strong indication that Hampden was the master mover, as we have long thought,) and so enjoyed the felicity of hearing London mobs howl for his head, as they had done before, at his instigation, for those of Laud and Strafford. At last, we arrive at the battle of *Marston Moor*, so disastrous to the royal cause, in which our biographer's hero was the Cavalier commander. It is admirably narrated; so well indeed, that we cannot refrain from making a very long quotation here, which will, we think, greatly interest our readers. We omit the military details of preparation for the field, though these are well given, reminding our readers only that this battle was fought on a widely extended heath in Yorkshire, and that Cromwell, with his Ironsides, was among the Roundhead host.

"For some hours the armies stood gazing on each other—nearly 50,000 kindred men, instigated by the strongest passion of hostility that ever animated the hearts of fair and open combatants. The evening set in with ominous gloom: the Puritans, who had wrought themselves up to a belief that Heaven was in strict league with their generals, were persuaded that the impending darkness was God's visible frown upon their enemies; they hailed the storm with grim joy—especially that dark and terrible mass of iron-clad men on the far left, who watched for Cromwell's battle-word. The storm grew darker, and the Roundhead annalist relates that, 'just as both armies were joining battle, and beginning the first encounter or assault of each other, it pleased the Lord, as it was most credibly affirmed for a certain truth, that a sudden and mighty great storm of rain and hail, and terrible claps of thunder were heard and seen from the clouds, as if Heaven had resolved to second the assault with a fierce alarm from above.' A loud hymn of triumph and denunciation rose among the Roundheads' ranks, and Rupert ordered prayers to be read at the same time to each regiment along his line. This striking fact is thus affirmed by his bitter and scornful enemy:—'Rupert, that bloody plunderer, would forsooth, to seem religious, just like a juggling Machiavellian, have a sermon preached before him and his army. His chaplain took his text out of Joshua xxii. 22. The words were these:—'The Lord God of gods, the Lord God of gods, he knoweth, and Israel shall know; if it be in rebellion, or if in transgression against the Lord, save us not this day.' I know not how Goring and his brother-reprobates conducted themselves in this solemn

prayer-time; but sure I am that Rupert was no hypocrite, and that the most reckless of his wild Cavaliers did not follow him less cheerily because his battle-cry was prefaced by a prayer. Still darker and gloomier fell the evening, and closer and murkier was the air, as the thunder of the skies was more and more frequently echoed by the artillery where Cromwell was, upon the far left among the guns. At length, the whole of the dark masses on either side seemed to catch fire from that flame; and bright, and loud, and far the artillery flashed, and the musketry sparkled along those formidable ranks. Then Rupert darted away to the head of his Cavaliers, who had hitherto kept the enemy at a distance by musketry placed among their ranks. At the same moment Byron[1], unable to restrain himself, led forth his cavalry from their strong position, and, before he could get them into order for a charge, Cromwell and Crauford were upon them, with the Ironsides and Manchester's cavalry: sweeping round the ditch, they cleared the range of the royal guns, and came upon the disordered Cavaliers upon fair ground, driving desperately into the midst of them. In a moment all was wild and terrible confusion there. But already Rupert and his fiery chivalry were among the Covenanting Scots upon the left, bursting at once into the very heart of their fierce and solemn host, scattering them like spray before some storm-driven ship, and plunging still onward to the front of their reserve. One moment's pause, one more wild shout and charge, and his life-guard are amongst *them* now." (The reserve.) "No pause—no mercy—scarcely resistance is found there. The whole mass, pursuers and pursued, sweeps by to yonder hill: the thundering hoofs, the ringing armour, the maddening shouts, the quick, sharp, frequent shot are scarcely heard.

"Nor was Goring idle then: it was at times like these this dauntless villain half redeemed his vices by his valour. The Scottish foot falter before his daring charge; his desperadoes are up to their very pikes—and within them now. The ground is carpeted with bloody tartans, as the Cavaliers press on through their tumultuous rout, and hew down the fugitives by scores. They are gone, and with them their pursuers; and two-thirds of the field is won.

"But the battle still rages fiercely on the centre of the royal line, now assailed by the left wing of the enemy: there Briton meets Briton, hand to hand, and foot to foot; every pike is thrust home, and every musket levelled low; and 'the very air seems all on fire,' and the 'ear is deafened with the roaring of artillery,' and the shouts and shrieks and curses of conquering or dying men. Lesley" (the Puritan) "now comes galloping up with his reserve of horse, and falls upon the masses already smitten by Cromwell's furious horse." (Ah, where was Rupert then?) "The Irish horse are slain or prisoners to a man. Their foot have retired towards York, and are rallied there by General King; and the conquerers sweep on like a foaming torrent to where Newcastle's brave yeomen, still and alone, stand firm. Firmly as their own sea-girt rocks those gallant Englishmen receive the shock. Again and again

[1] A royal general.

the fiery fanatics rush upon their planted pikes, and receive their steady fire. Many a brave Yorkshireman lies crushed and writhing before every charge, but still their narrowing ranks are stedfast and dauntless as before. And now their own guns are turned upon them by Cromwell's artillerymen, and between each charge of cavalry the iron storm makes fearful chasms in their column. But still they stood. Before the most mettled steed could reach their line, it was compact again. They fell, to a man, on the spot where the gallant Cavendish first planted them!

"And now the conquerors on either side have done their work, and have time to rally and breathe, and look around them, each moving to regain his battle-ground, when, lo! as if starting from the dead, each victor meets another, returning from the slaughter of his enemies, to claim the victory. Then came the severest trial of the day. Each occupied the ground his enemy had covered when the fight began; and through the lurid and sulphurous shades of approaching night was seen the gleaming armour of another hostile line. Then it was that Rupert's followers failed him—the high and sparkling mettle of his Cavaliers, consuming all before it in the first outbreak, fainted now before the sustained flame of fanaticism that burned in the Puritans' excited hearts. Still Rupert strove to rally his panting and exhausted troops; still his loud battle-cry, 'For God and for the King!' rose above the din; but he no longer found an echo to that cry. The Puritans galloped up to his Cavaliers, and met with scarcely an antagonist; 'their enemies were scattered before them,' as they too truly said. Away over the broken ground, and dismounted guns, and shattered carriages the Cavaliers are flying through the darkness, and leave the bloodily contested field to the Puritans and—Cromwell.

"The prince, deserted by his regiment, still strove to rally a few followers, but in vain: wherever a group was gathered, the Roundhead horse were upon them in irresistible force; and at length Rupert was left alone. Then, rousing his gallant horse for one last effort, he cleared a high fence into a bean-field, and, thus sheltered, made his way from the field so fatal to his fame. With what agony of heart must that proud young soldier have retreated before his despised and avenging foes, to meet the consequences of his defeat! Yet was he not wanting then to the sad but noble duty of a general in retreat. He rallied such men as he could find unparalysed by panic, and collected a few squadrons of dragoons. These he led forward at a gallop to where the heath was bounded by inclosures, and narrow lanes afforded the only approach to York. Here, dismounting his men, he lined the hedges, and received the pursuers with so close a fire, that even Cromwell paused, and called off his men. The Irish foot, placed in reserve to the left wing, had been rallied near York by General King, and now formed a safeguard for the fugitives. Then silence, the silence of the dead, only broken by the groans of the dying, fell upon the battle-field,—and all was over."

This is a battle-scene indeed, almost unparalleled for interest and animation. Here we have the stir, the strife,

"And all the tumult of the heady fight."

Well might Scott say, in his vigorous "Rokeby:"—

"The battle's rage
Was like the strife which currents wage,
Where Orinoco, in his pride,
Rolls to the main no tribute tide,
But 'gainst broad ocean urges far
A rival sea of roaring war!
While, in ten thousand eddies driven,
The billows fling their foam to heaven;
And the pale pilot seeks, in vain,
Where rolls the river, where the main."

Yet, despite "hot Rupert's" gallantry and fire, we cannot acquit him of grievous blame for his share in this disaster. In the first instance he obviously left his original post too speedily, thereby inducing Byron to rush out in fiery emulation, though against orders, and expose himself at a disadvantage to Cromwell's charge. Again, it is manifest that the prince pursued the Scots too far, and with absolutely reckless impetuosity, when nothing could be gained thereby. Had not his Cavaliers' steeds been jaded, and themselves exhausted by this fruitless toil, they would never have deserted their leader almost without a blow, when they met Cromwell's Ironsides returning from pursuit. The latter were comparatively fresh and unjaded. This was partly owing, no doubt, to the gallant stand made by the Yorkshiremen who would not tempt them to pursuit; but we need not doubt that any such temptation would have failed to ensnare the equally bold and careful Cromwell. Here, as on Naseby Field, we have the clearest evidence that Rupert was the bravest of men, and the most dashing of cavalry officers; but it cannot surely be disputed that he was, further, a most imperfect general. For once "commonplace" is in the right. Not that he did not possess all the requisite mental qualifications; his only military vice was an inordinate love of fighting; and, alas! this cost his royal master dear. We will not dwell on the liberality of sentiment displayed by the Puritans in exulting over the death, upon this field of battle, of Prince Rupert's canine attendant, whom they believed to be an imp of darkness. Their "moderation was always known unto all men." The king does not appear to have lost confidence in, or to have addressed a single reproval to, his nephew; he knew, indeed, that the prince had done his best, and that no man suffered more than he. From this period we meet with little but royal reverses and Puritan triumphs; and the record of these disasters is rather disheartening. Soon, however, we arrive

at the scene of decision, the battle-field of Naseby. Here, as usual in such cases, Mr. Warburton's narrative is very spirited and animated. We have no space to quote it; and, besides, one battle is enough for an article. The unhappy treason, or seeming treason, of Carmarthen in turning the monarch's steed at the moment of decision, is dramatically recorded. But we altogether deny that "the king suffered himself to be led away like a child." Where is the proof of any such assertion? On the contrary, he strove to return; but it was too late. To the last, he with Rupert endeavoured to rally the flying cavalry! On *this* occasion the king's letters to the queen were seized and published by the victorious rebels. Thus faintly speaks Mr. Warburton on this theme:—"The celebrated collection of letters was immediately published by the Parliament; and the world then, and for the most part now, believed and believes his correspondence to have been one tissue of perjury and falsehood. Those who take the trouble to read these letters (Harleian Misellany, v. 514) will be surprised to find on what slight foundation this assertion has been founded." (We should rather say, that it was without the shadow of a foundation.) "The fondest affection for the queen, indeed, breathes through all the letters, and the most unbounded confidence: there is many a political intrigue alluded to," (and what then?) "and many matters confessed to the queen that never had been related to the public;" (is this extraordinary?) "but, *considering* the *reputed* falsehood of the king, and the tortuous line of action in which he was compelled to wander in avoiding his innumerable and implacable enemies from within and from without,—*considering all this*, the accusations against him *seem* to owe much of their weight to *party feeling*." (Rather owe their origin to the most barefaced lying, and are fostered by the weakest or the most malignant bigotry.) "If," adds Mr. Warburton, for once telling the plain truth of these mighty Puritans, the champions of freedom,—"if the dark and crafty Cromwell's, or the deep and plotting Pym's, most private correspondence had been laid open to the world by their enemies, how would it stand in comparison? The former of these two professed, that it was lawful to play the knave with a knave, and the latter acted on the axiom." We might have added the name of Hampden here, did we not remember that *he* was far too crafty to trust his craft to any paper, or have any real confidant on earth. The king himself said of these letters:—"Nor can any man's malice be gratified further by my letters than to see my constancy to my wife, the laws, and religion. Bees will gather honey where the spider sucks poison. The integrity of my intentions is not

jealous of any injury my expressions can do them; for, although the confidence of privacy may admit greater freedom in writing such letters, which may be liable to envious exceptions, yet the innocency of my chief purposes cannot be so strained or misinterpreted by them as not to let all men see that I wish nothing more than a happy composure of differences with justice and honour; not more to my own than my people's content, who have any sparks of love or loyalty left in them; who, by those my letters, may be convinced, that I can both act and mind my own and my kingdom's affairs so as becomes a prince." And yet, despite all this, though Mr. Warburton, on full consideration, acquits the martyr-king of guilt with respect to that correspondence on which almost all the most weighty charges of insincerity are founded, he is, strange to say, so possessed himself by the vulgar prejudice which he combats, as to give us frequent occasions of learning that falsehood was, in his opinion also, the king's one vice. Surely he forgets against *whom* he brings this weighty charge so lightly:—against a saint of God, against one of whom he himself confesses, that he was not only affectionate, kind, and just, but also deeply pious. The insincerity attributed to him is obviously out of keeping with all this: it would be one single monstrous blood-red spot standing alone on a snow-white shield. It is confessed on all sides, that King Charles died the death of a martyr: it is equally undisputed, that whilst deeply humbled before his God for his own and his nation's sins, (for he too was a man, and therefore not faultless, and what *we* might think slight errors might appear crimes to him,) he never acknowledged in the slightest degree the truth of this "eternal" imputation, never confessed his regret for a single act of insincerity. Still our adversaries will not be daunted by this memory; they will assure us that this loving Christian monarch thought falsehood kingcraft. Surely every generous reader must needs exclaim, "Credat Carlyle, non ego!" In the appendix to his second volume, Mr. Warburton gives the passages from the king's correspondence which have been most objected to. One of them runs thus:—"Nothing can be more evident than that Strafford's innocent blood hath been one of the great causes of God's just judgments upon this nation by a furious civil war, both sides hitherto being almost equally punished as being in a manner equally guilty." We have had occasion to demonstrate the truth of this. But, verily, such contemptible calumnies would be beneath notice, were they not caught up and echoed by such fashionable party-writers as Mr. Macaulay. He has dared (milder language we cannot employ) to found the most insolent charges against our royal saint upon this very correspondence.

When he stands before the judgment-seat of his Maker, he will have to answer for all these; for, if every idle word shall be brought into condemnation, how much more the records of the historian, whose professed purport is to enlighten the minds of the present and of all future ages, and enable them to form a just judgment of the past. May he be able in that great hour to clear himself from the suspicion of voluntary and intentional falsehood as fully as the martyr-king whom he has ventured to calumniate.

From this point onward all is dismay and discomforture, save that the unfailing courage of the royal sufferer shines as the distant polar star over a waste of icy billows. The good spirit of Prince Rupert at last deserted him. Though his conduct in the surrender of Bristol might not be as censurable as it at first appeared, the dignified reproof the king was by no means too severe. Even Mr. Warburton appears to disapprove of the stubborn, dogged anger his hero now evinced, and still more of his subsequent heat when he banished himself at Newark from the royal presence. However, we are happy to find that he subsequently repented his hot perversity, and wrote a very noble letter to the king, expressing his contrition, which Mr. Warburton has inserted, vol. iii. p. 224. After this he fought his way through to Oxford, and saw his royal uncle once again—alas! for the last time. Soon after the king took refuge in Scotland, and Rupert went across the seas. We cannot follow him through the next long chapter, "Rupert at Sea," though this also contains much to interest. He fought with his wonted valour in a French campaign against the Spaniards; returning to Paris, he received a most affectionate letter from King Charles, then a prisoner at Hampton Court, which Mr. Warburton gives us; finally, after a fruitless expedition to the coast of England, we find him as an admiral crossing the deep to the West Indies. This expedition is described at length, mainly from an ancient manuscript; but we cannot linger over so discursive a theme. We now return once more to the captive monarch. Mr. Warburton has described his martyrdom finely, but of course briefly. He mentions one circumstance, concerning "a refinement on humiliation," which, as he says, has not been generally noticed. This is, that "the headsman's block was *so low* that the king *was obliged to lie along the floor in order to reach it with his neck.*" This, as far at least as we know, was a novel form of martyrdom. "Charles Stuart," says Mr. Warburton, "slaughtered by hypocrites, fanatics, and traitors, lay calmly in his coffin, in the midst of the Banqueting Hall, in the darkness and silence of midnight. His destroyer was not so calm, though he had conquered: impelled by the horror of suspense, he went to visit the dead king. Did

he not envy the dead majesty that lay there in calm repose, its life-work done?" The death of some noble Cavaliers is next related, and then we pass to the last scenes of Rupert's long and honourable career. His philosophical studies, the brave exploits of his old age in maintaining the sinking fame of England on the seas against her bravest enemy—the Hollander; his straightforward manly reprobation of the corrupt practices of Charles the Second's administration, which almost forced a blush to the brazen brow of that "Merry Monarch;" his final decease, not indeed old in years as in honours, for he was but sixty-three, leaving no honester, braver, or more true-hearted man behind him, as his biographer aptly says—all these are brought before us in what may be considered the epilogue to this comprehensive and interesting work. Rupert was rather the man of action than of thought; and yet his thoughts also were generally just, and sometimes deep. If he was not altogether free from the vices which stained his age in the world's history, especially in the latter half of his career, he was nevertheless far more moral than the majority of his contemporaries, and must always be dear to loyal hearts as the chivalric champion of a falling monarch. Often on the losing side, he was yet singularly successful in all his personal operations, and never charged at the head of his horse without carrying all before him. Though his broadsword was frequently red with blood, he had a kind and gentle heart; for he was a dutiful and affectionate son, a loving brother, a faithful subject, and a generous foe; and of him it may be truly said,—

> "For the rights of fair England that broadsword he draws;
> His king is his leader, his Church is his cause:
> His watchword is honour, his pay is renown,—
> God strike with the gallant that strikes for the crown!"

Finally, we must be permitted to cite some few anecdotes from the interesting volumes before us, which will serve incidentally to illustrate the characters of the king, his adherents, and his adversaries, which may not be familiar to our readers. Thus we read, vol. i. p. 71: "An amiable anecdote is told of Charles during the civil wars, which may as well be mentioned here. He wished to consult some volume in the Bodleian Library, and sent for it. The librarian, with simple fidelity to his rules, replied, that no books once entered there were ever allowed to leave it. This message being brought to the king, he rose up, put on his hat, and went himself to seek for the volume as modestly as any sizar." This, we observe, is quoted from "Jesse." Mr. Warburton gives an interesting account of Charles's court. Mr.

Disraeli had before remarked of it: "We may rate Charles's taste at the supreme degree, by remarking that this monarch never patronised mediocrity: the artist who was honoured by his regard was ever a master-spirit." We may observe, that in poetry, also, King Charles's taste was faultless. Ben Jonson, the first of living bards, was his great favourite; and "rare Ben" has recorded the monarch's ceaseless generosity and his own loyal affection in many a noble strain. Such is the contemptible spite entertained by the majority of the smaller literary fry for Charles's memory, that they have not scrupled to place an infamous slander on his king even on Ben Jonson's lips, accusing the monarch of a lack of generosity. Shakspeare, we may further observe, was the constant companion of the martyr-monarch. The Puritans thought it his "familiar," and said he made almost as much account of it as of the Bible. That Charles's court was attractive, we may conclude from the youthful Rupert's strong asseveration: "For being a hunting that morning with the king, he wished he might break his neck so he might leave his bones in England." (See p. 76.) Further on, we are reminded (p. 141) that "Henry Martyn, the regicide, said in the House of Commons, 'If we must have a king, I would rather have the last gentleman than any other;'" while "Baillie, a stern Covenanter, spoke of him as 'a most just, reasonable, and sweet person.'"

On page 177 we learn, from Sir P. Warwick's memoirs, that "the bowing at the name of Jesus had a book written against it with no less title than '*Jesus-worship confuted*:' so, if a Mahometan had heard it cried in the streets to be sold (as it was), surely he might justly have thought this nation at that time was denying their Saviour." We may observe, that Mr. Warburton is totally incorrect in imagining that the king faltered or broke down on discovering the flight of "the five members." He spoke temperately, but nobly; and his exact words are on record.

On page 246 we read: "A statue was made by Bernini, from a picture of King Charles, whose name was carefully concealed from the sculptor. Signor Bernini, after looking for some time stedfastly upon it, said, 'that he had never seen a face which showed so much greatness, and, withal, such marks of sadness and misfortune.'" Mr. Warburton singularly charges the king with an unworthy mental reservation (on p. 243), because he told the commissioners of parliament that "he had no thought but of peace and justice to his people." What is the obvious meaning of "no thought" here? Clearly that he wished for nothing else. Not that the idea had never entered

into his mind that he *might be* driven to defend his crown, which is the strange assertion imputed to him by Mr. Warburton. But this is the hypercritical fashion after which every word, every syllable of the martyr-monarch's is weighed in the balance of suspicion, and then treasured up against him as proofs of his "duplicity," "curses of his life," &c. &c. These hard words are actually employed on the page before us, upon this special provocation! Surely it is high time to abandon such childish and absurd imputations. Another record of Roundhead insolence will be found on page 278. "Young Fairfax pressed *courageously* through the royal guard, and, reaching the king, forced the petition on his notice. The king turned away, but Sir Thomas laid his charge on his saddle-bow, and, in doing so, was nearly ridden over by the insulted and angry monarch." Another anecdote may edify our readers. "Mr. Bond, one of the presumptuous 'saints' preaching at the Savoy, told his auditors, 'that they ought to contribute and pray, and do all they were able to bring about their brethren of Scotland, for settling of God's cause:— *I say this is God's cause; and if our God hath any cause, this is it: and if this be not God's cause, then God is no God for me, but the devil is got up into heaven.*'" Truly, the only God of these Puritans was their own carnal and seditious will.

On page 352 Mr. Warburton very justly stigmatises Milton for his brutal and insolent abuse of King Charles, as being "as meanly rancorous as a partisan" as he is "sublime as a poet." How sad it is that we are compelled to think thus meanly of a Milton! Turning to a very different theme, we find that Sir Philip Warwick, whom Mr. Warburton calls "the Froissart of the Cavaliers," has celebrated Rupert "as that brave prince and hopeful soldier," and has borne him witness that "he put that spirit into the king's army, that all men seemed resolved."

Our author has given us a very animated and happy description of Oxford during the period of King Charles's abode in that loyal city in his second volume, but we have no space to extract it. There is also an interesting letter from the Countess of Denbigh to her son in this same volume; a sample, no doubt, of many a touching appeal occasioned by the distresses of those evil days. There is a bit of scandal on page 221, in a note anent the reputation of Queen Henrietta, which had better be removed, we should say, from the next edition, since it seems to be without foundation, though we have no great affection for the memory of that daughter of "Henri Quatre." An instance of Prince Rupert's activity will be found a page or two further on. "On the 2nd," says Mr. Warburton, "an incident is recorded in his highness's journal, which scarcely comports with what is called

the gravity of history. Early in the morning, as he was shaving, intelligence was brought that the enemy was approaching Whitebridge. He threw himself into his saddle half-shaved, rode off to meet, charge, and rout the foe, and then returned to finish his toilet."—The following fantastic letter of Lord Newcastle's to the prince will be found page 397 :—" May it please your highness, In the first place I congratulate *your huge and great victories*, which indeed *is fit for none but your highness.* For all the affairs in the north I refer your highness to this bearer, Sir John Mayne, who can tell your highness every particular: only this I must assure your highness, that the Scots *are as big again* in foot as I am, and their horse, I doubt, much better than ours are: so that if your highness do not please to come hither, and that very soon too, *the great game of your uncle's will be endangered*, if not lost; and with your highness being near, certainly won: so I doubt not but your highness will come, and that very soon. Your highness's *most passionate creature*, W. Newcastle."

We might cite many other interesting anecdotes and traits of character from these two, as well as from the third volume, but must content ourselves with recording these two circumstances, with which we did not happen to be before acquainted; first, that at King Charles's coronation, Senhouse, bishop of Carlisle, preached the sermon on the equally ominous and glorious text from Rev. ii. 10, " Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life ;" and secondly, that at his funeral the snow fell thick upon his pall, so that, as Herbert says, " it was all white, the colour of innocency; so went the white king to his grave."

Perhaps we should have apologised to our readers as to Mr. Warburton, for having written so much or more of King Charles than of Prince Rupert and the Cavaliers. But who that approaches the history of these days with a loyal heart can fail to be attracted towards the royal martyr? It is *his* saintly image which beams through that civil tempest with a mild and lovely halo, and seems almost to endear the records of its darkest broils. Truly, a galaxy of noble hearts was gathered round him,—Sir Bevil Glanvil, honest Ralph Hopton, brave Trelawney, Carnarvon, Sidney Godolphin, Astley, Grandison, Capell, those peers too who performed the last sad honours to their beloved and departed master, Richmond, Hertford, Lindsey, and Southampton, and last, not least, the gallant dauntless " Cavalier of Cavaliers," Prince Rupert. Courage, physical courage at least, was not wanting to the royalists; alas! moral courage was. The Hydes and Falklands failed to perform their duty, until it was too late! And now, in our own days, who can doubt that our nobility and gentry would fight full as gallantly as their ancestors, for the cause of the

Crown and the Church—fight, that is, with deeds, when called on; but not, alas! with milder, but apparently far less easily attainable weapons! Let us hope for the best. Surely all the prayers that have ascended from so many holy men—surely the flame of renovation which has sprung forth amongst us to purify and to brighten, surely the evidences of life visible far and wide within our Anglican community, surely all these will prevent our utter downfal, will fire us to combat against the spirit of lawless disobedience, will enable us to save law and order, even amidst the wreck of empires and of nations.

It is almost needless to say that the paper and print of Mr. Warburton's work, together with the fine engravings it contains, render it an ornament for any library. The portraits of Prince Rupert himself, the elegant and aristocratic Marquis of Worcester, and the famous Montrose will be found peculiarly interesting. We conclude our imperfect review with the confession of our gratitude to Mr. Warburton for his obviously long and careful labours, and with the assurance that we consider "Prince Rupert and the Cavaliers" a valuable contribution to the literature of our great civil war, and a production worthy of the author of "The Crescent and the Cross."

Art. II.—*Mornings amongst the Jesuits at Rome. Being Notes of Conversations held with certain Jesuits on the subject of Religion in the City of Rome. By the Rev.* M. Hobart Seymour, M.A. London: Seeleys.

We confess to opening this volume with some degree of prejudice against the author's name, we scarcely know why; and with some distrust as to the line of argument which he might adopt. In truth, such feelings must cross the mind in commencing the perusal of almost any new work on Romish controversy; for we generally find little of novelty in the argument, and when there *is* novelty, it is usually more or less erroneous. Exaggeration we too frequently see; and, above all, we observe confusion of ideas, and a disposition to concede positions which, though apparently unimportant, are, in fact, the turning points of the whole controversy. Men too frequently enter on discussions of this kind without sufficient previous study, and therefore fall into mistakes of various kinds. In one direction they adopt principles which tend to the subversion of all positive religion; or, in the other, they are entangled in the meshes of Jesuitism, and become slavish admirers of the very worst and most dangerous parts of the Romish system.

Mr. Seymour is no tyro in the Romish controversy: he has evidently bestowed on it years of thought and research; for though his work is quite of a popular character, and carries no apparatus of learning along with it, being free from quotations, references, &c., yet to argue in the way he has done, proves the possession of a complete mastery in his subject. In perusing the "Mornings amongst the Jesuits," we are reminded of the exclamation of King Henry VIII., when Cranmer's suggestion of applying to the universities in the cause of his marriage was mentioned to him—"He has got the sow by the right ear!" Mr. Seymour *has* the animal in his clutches; and a woeful tweaking has he administered, while he stands over his prostrate victim with an air of benevolence and politeness, which adds severely to the infliction. We confess that we have often laughed heartily over Mr. Seymour's pages; for the rout of his opponents by the ability of his tactics, when contrasted with their previous triumphant assurance, is so complete, and the quiet way in which he works up these cunning men to the point he wants, and

then pounces upon them with some argument that they cannot answer, is so singular, that it reminds us more of Mr. Waterton's feat of turning over the fore feet of the crocodile, and employing them as reins, while he bestrode the monster in a new kind of saltatory equestrian exercise, than of any thing else within our recollection. The notion of *outwitting* and puzzling the Jesuits is certainly what would not occur to ordinary minds; but Mr. Seymour has positively achieved the feat. We believe the whole of his narrative to be true: to us it carries internal evidence of its truth. The arguments employed on the Jesuits' side are precisely those which the most subtle and unscrupulous disputants of the Church of Rome invariably employ as their very best. The air of confidence, assurance, and triumph with which they were given, is also ably and characteristically described; and the judgment and ability of the way in which the discussion was conducted, together with the evident sincerity of the author of this work, forbid us to distrust in any way the substantial accuracy and fairness of the report.

Mr. Seymour, as we learn from the preface to his volume, visited Rome with a view to study the true genius of the Church of Rome, and to judge for himself as to her nature and character. In the pursuit of this object, he immediately became a diligent attendant on all the rites of the Church of Rome, was present at every procession, exposition of relics, unusual ceremonial, attended whenever the pope or cardinals were to be present; was at every remarkable funeral, reception into a nunnery, festival, &c. In short, he appears to have availed himself of every opportunity of seeing the whole of the Roman Catholic system with his own eyes. This punctuality and assiduity in attendance on the Romish worship had the not unnatural effect of leading some zealous members of the Romish Church to the notion that our author was in a hopeful state of progress towards conversion. Actuated by such pleasing anticipations, a Roman gentleman of station suggested to our author, whether some communication with the ecclesiastics of Rome might not be desirable; and having learned that such acquaintance would be acceptable, he proceeded at once to place this very hopeful case in the hands of the Jesuits; two of whom, by direction of the Padre-generale of the Jesuits, visited Mr. Seymour, and conversed with him on controversial subjects, evidently anticipating an easy conquest. The convert, however, proved rather more difficult to convince than could have been expected; and so he was handed on to the Professor of Theology and Canon Law, and other learned Jesuits, who do not seem to have made much of him; and have probably often wished from the bottom of their hearts, that they

may never again have to deal with a hopeful convert of *this kind.*

We must introduce the reader to the two ecclesiastics who waited on Mr. Seymour by desire of the Padre-generale.

"I had returned home after this spectacle [an ordination], and was looking over the Pontifical, examining a point which had much impressed me, when two visitors were announced. They were two Jesuits. They came in the peculiar costume of the order. One was a priest, and the other a lay-brother; but, according to the rule of the order, as observed at Rome, they were robed alike, the whole body, from the padre-generale himself to the lowliest lay-brother who is porter at the gate, being dressed in costume precisely the same. It consists of a black cassock, extending from the throat to the ankles, without any ornament beyond a little brass medal and chain suspended to the waist. The cravat is white, but so narrow as to be scarcely observable above the cassock, and over all is a black cloak, neat, plain, and without sleeves. The hat is remarkable for the great breadth of its leaf. It is not red like those of the cardinals, nor white like those of the camaldolines, nor decorated with rosettes and bands of orange, green, &c., like those of the prelates, all which seem so strange to our English tastes. It is black, and turned up slightly at the sides, without any bow or other ornament. The costume as a whole is neat and seemly, and as elegant and becoming as any ecclesiastical or academic costume can be. It certainly surpasses in this particular the style and appearance of the other monastic or religious orders; for it bears the stamp of studied neatness and propriety, while that of some of the other orders is exquisitely grotesque and ridiculous.

"In a few moments we all were as much at ease as the peculiar nature and object of the visit could permit. The interchange of mutual courtesies, and some words upon general subjects, soon led to the object of our meeting."—pp. 10, 11.

The conversation turned at first on the Oxford movement, and the divisions in the Roman Catholic Church in Germany, and from thence passed on to the doctrine of absolution in the Church of Rome, in which our author placed the Jesuits in considerable difficulty; but we have not space to dwell on this branch of the subject,—we pass on to discussions of a more general nature.

In chapter III. we have an account of a visit paid to Mr. Seymour by "a reverend gentleman who had originally been a Protestant, and had entered the Church of Rome." This gentleman enlarged on the delight and happiness which he had experienced since becoming a Romanist.

"He entered into some details of his former history, in fact the story of his life, and concluded by saying that he had never known peace or happiness until he had taken the final step; and then, and from that

moment, he had experienced a tranquillity of mind and a satisfaction of feeling, a joy and delight which he had never known before. . . . . He then added, that he believed that this happiness was experienced by all who, like him, embraced the Church of Rome,—that he knew it to be the experience of others as well as his own,—that he could not regard it otherwise than as the special gift and blessing of God,—the reward of heaven to those who entered his true Church,—and that if I took the same step, I should assuredly be partaker of the same reward."—pp. 63, 64.

Many persons would have been in some degree staggered by a statement of this kind, and would scarcely have known how to reply to it without danger of giving offence to the speaker. But Mr. Seymour replies, with great address and propriety, in the following way:—

"I answered all this by stating that I could well understand it, as I had seen very much of the same nature in the case of persons who had acted in a manner the very opposite to that which he had adopted. I had known many persons who had been brought up from infancy in all the principles and practices of the Church of Rome,—who, by the reading of the Holy Scriptures, or by hearing the preaching of the Gospel, have been led to entertain doubts as to the verity of their former faith, and to receive and adopt the simple and scriptural principles of Protestantism; and so to go on to the final step of embracing the communion of Protestants; and such persons have often told me of the peace of mind and happiness of heart,—the gush of joy and delight that they experienced in forsaking, by that act, what they regarded as the unscriptural and unstable errors of one Church, for the scriptural and stable truth of the other; speaking with rapturous ecstasy of peace and joy which they had never known before, and of the sweetness of which they had previously no conception. I added, that I supposed this feeling among those who embraced the Roman faith, and among those who embraced the Protestant faith—this feeling common to both alike—may arise from the casting aside the doubts and difficulties that had previously occupied and absorbed the mind; but that I could not regard it as a reward or recompense for the final step,—that I could not think that God would give this reward to both sides, to the Romanist for embracing Protestantism, and to the Protestant for embracing Romanism."—pp. 64, 65.

This was as complete an answer as could have been given. To judge of the rectitude of the course taken in a change of religion by the feelings by which it may be followed, is indeed a most fallacious test. We have heard of persons becoming Unitarians,—Blanco White, for instance,—and then expressing to their friends the relief and peace of mind which they have experienced in consequence. Without doubt a mind which has long been tossed on a sea of doubts and difficulties generally experiences a feeling of

great relief and happiness as soon as its course has been decidedly taken, whether that course be right or wrong in itself.

The "reverend gentleman," finding himself unexpectedly foiled in this attempt, returned to the attack in another direction. He urged upon Mr. Seymour that he would certainly only attain peace and happiness in joining the Church of Rome, that "if he would only resolve to fling away his doubts and difficulties—if, instead of making objections and answering arguments, and requiring reasons and proofs—if, instead of all this, he would but fling them to the winds, and boldly and unhesitatingly enter the Church of Rome, he would escape all the harassing anxieties of doubt, and all the awfulness of infidelity . . . that he must else continue in doubt and difficulty . . . . that he must end in infidelity. There was no escape but in the Church of Rome."

He proceeded to urge that the only wise course, and that which would bring most comfort was to throw aside all doubts and difficulties, remembering that all questions had been already decided by the infallible authority of the Church. We must give the answer :—

"I said in reply to all this, that I could well understand such a course as an easy and effectual way of disposing of some difficulties; and that I had long been in the habit of acting on it. I fully felt the value and indeed the necessity for a tribunal, an infallible tribunal, to determine the religious difficulty of my mind. . . . My friend seemed to accept this as all he required, and was about to proceed with his argument, when I continued to say that I had found and felt that the Holy Scriptures were the Word of God,—that they were inspired by Him, and therefore were infallible . . . . I added that the difference between him and me was, that he bowed to a supposed authority, the inspiration and divinity of which I denied; while I bowed to an authority whose inspiration and divinity was admitted by all. He yielded to the decisions of the papal bulls, while I bowed to the decisions of the Holy Scriptures."—pp. 68, 69.

This was well said: it is a retort on that well-known argument of Romanists—"*You* admit that we can be saved: *we* deny that you can be saved; therefore it is safest to enter the communion in which all allow salvation can be obtained." Mr. Seymour has sharpened his weapons on the Romish whetstone. His argument here is to us altogether novel. The reply was "precisely what he had anticipated." It consisted in the usual argument to show the unfitness of Scripture for any settlement of controversies. It was observed that if ten men could be produced who would agree in one interpretation, he could produce as many agreeing in a different interpretation, and that this liability to different interpre-

tations rendered the Scriptures unfit for the settlement of controversies or difficulties.

This species of argument must be familiar to every one who is in any degree versed in the Romish controversy, and it is often urged with perfect success. But it was not so in the case of our author. His answer was as follows—and an excellent answer it was :—

"I rejoined to this, that although the argument has often before been used in many works of controversy, yet it had never seemed to me to have weight in the matter for which it was advanced, because the very same objection in all its force was as applicable to all the system of the Church of Rome. If appeal be made to the canon law,—if reference be made to the writings of the primitive fathers,—if the appeal be made to the decrees of councils,—if the reference be made to the bulls of popes,—if, in short, it be made to any documents, supposed to contain the infallible mind of the Church, there will be found as great a diversity of interpretation, as if the reference be made to the Holy Scriptures."—p. 70.

Well said, again. Here Mr. Seymour has his Roman Catholic friend in a very awkward position. For most assuredly his argument is unanswerable. No one can deny that the fact is so ; at least no one possessing moderate information on such subjects. And assuredly it is *rather* an awkward position for a Romanist to occupy, when he is compelled on his own principles to maintain that all existing decrees of councils, bulls of popes, canons, liturgies, writings of the fathers, are just as inadequate as the Scriptures to the solution of difficulties, or the settlement of controversies. This leaves him a very narrow corner of ground to rest his foot upon. And thither our author follows him :—

"He acknowledged frankly, and at once, that he thought my answer sufficient, so far as these writings, canons, decrees, and bulls, that have been already passed or written, are concerned. They are mere written documents, and as such they necessarily become liable to various interpretation in the hands of able and subtle men. They are all, therefore, in the same category, and liable to the same objection as the Holy Scriptures. He would fully admit this. *But* he thought that the great advantage of the Church of Rome consisted in having one who, as the head of the Church, was a living and speaking judge, who could at any moment determine infallibly the question under debate."—p. 72.

Our author replied, by apologizing for the character of his mind, which, he said, required some clear proof in all matters of importance. He, therefore, requested his Roman Catholic friend to state to him the grounds on which he believed in the existence of any such infallible living tribunal in the Church, as he spoke of, considering the extreme importance of the doctrine in question.

The Roman Catholic assented to this, and said he would state his reasons. "One argument for the existence of this tribunal was *necessity*." The controversies, discussions, difficulties, schisms, &c., amongst Christians required some tribunal for their infallible decision; therefore such a tribunal *must exist*. The necessity of this inference was denied by Mr. Seymour; and his opponent was obliged to confess that it could not be defended as a logical conclusion. But he proceeded to argue that the usefulness and convenience of such a tribunal was so obvious that we must suppose a good and beneficent God must have granted it to the Church. On being pressed again, he was obliged to admit that *this* inference also, was not logically defensible.

"I asked him quietly,—Do you yourself think, that your proving it to be convenient, or useful, or desirable for the Church, is really proving that it does exist in the Church? Do you yourself think, that in logic you are justified in inferring the existence of any thing from the supposed usefulness of the thing? . . . It would, I acknowledged, undoubtedly be very convenient and useful to us, that hell with all its horrors should be annihilated; but we are not justified in believing, therefore, that hell is annihilated. It would also, without any question, be useful and convenient for us beyond expression, that sin should be abolished and driven from the world; but we are not, therefore, to infer that sin is so abolished. . . . And, in the same way, I continued, our proving the convenience or usefulness of an infallible tribunal, other and besides the Holy Scriptures, or its suitableness to the goodness of God, cannot be regarded as any adequate argument to prove that God has actually established it. The question is, not what God could or might have done, but what He has done."—pp. 76, 77.

To this there was only one answer to be returned. The Romanist was obliged to confess that his argument had failed, and was untenable. But he shortly returned to the charge on a different ground. He urged a principle with which we have been familiarized in the writings of Messrs. Newman, Ward, Oakeley, and their friends. He contended that we may assume the existence of an infallible tribunal *without proof*, in the same way as we assume the existence of God without proof. The existence of God is incapable of proof, and yet we believe it; why then should we not believe equally an infallible tribunal to exist? Mr. Seymour, in reply, denied that we assume the existence of a First Cause; but that, on the contrary, we *prove* it, except when it is already acknowledged; and therefore if the existence of an infallible tribunal on earth be parallel to this, it ought also to be proved.

We pass reluctantly over the earlier part of a very curious and able argument on the subject of the locality of this assumed

infallibility (pp. 87—99); and come to the discussion of the main question with the Professors of Dogmatic Theology and Canon Law in the Collegio Romano. We must here make rather a long extract.

"He [the Professor of Dogmatic Theology] immediately proposed to me to argue the question of the possibility of salvation in the Church of England . . . undertaking, on his part, to prove against me that the Church of England was not the Church of Christ; and that while I continued a member of the Church of England I could not be saved. It was a formal challenge.

"I replied that I could not assert that the Church of England was *the Church* of Christ—that I believed and held she was *a part, a member, a branch of the Church* of Christ—that she held all necessary truth, and that salvation was to be found within her, and that I was prepared to maintain thus far, but no farther. I could not defend the proposition in the form in which he proposed it.

"He said that he would shape his argument so as to embrace that view, and then, before he commenced, we agreed that nothing should be asserted respecting the doctrine of either Church, by either him or myself, without producing the canon, or decree, or bull, or article of the Church containing it. He was not to claim for the Church of Rome, nor to ascribe to the Church of England any thing whatever without producing the authoritative canon of one Church, or the authoritative article of the other. I was pledged in the same way . . . I was careful to have this settled between us before proceeding farther, as I perceived he was disposed to enter on the question more as a practised and confident controversialist, than as a sincere inquirer. He seemed a bold, lively, warm-hearted man, experienced in the disputations of the College, and confident in his own resources. . . . He commenced according to the method still practised in the classes of the College, namely, arguing in the form of a syllogism. He said—

"The Church of Christ is infallible.

"The Church of England confesses herself fallible.

"Therefore the Church of England is not the Church of Christ.

"I at once pointed out the fallacy or error of his argument, showing, as I had already stated, that the Church of England did not pretend to be the Church of Christ, but only a part, or branch, or member of it; and that the fallibility of a part of the Church was no proof she was not a part of the Church, to which only, as a whole, infallibility could belong.

"He acknowledged this to be sufficient, and said he could state his argument in another form.

"The Church of Christ, in all her parts, is infallible.

"The Protestant Church of England confesses herself fallible.

"Therefore the Church of England is not a part of the Church of Christ.

"I conceived that this syllogism was as faulty as the preceding one;

but that I would at once meet it by denying his minor; that is, by denying that the Protestant Church of England confesses herself to be fallible. I was not aware that she had made such a confession.

"He laughed at me good-humouredly, and with a look of triumph, and said that the Church of England had confessed it, and he could produce the Article. He referred me to Article xix.

"I produced the Article and read the words, 'As the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith!' I said that this Article of the Church of England asserted that other Churches, and the Church of Rome in particular, had erred, and were fallible, but that she had said nothing of herself; and certainly had not, as his argument supposed and required, confessed herself fallible.

"He frankly acknowledged this to be a sufficient answer, and that his argument had failed, but said he would arrange his syllogism in another form so as to obviate this. He seemed, however, slightly, very slightly, annoyed, at finding himself so easily foiled in his first two attempts. He proceeded with great quickness to arrange his argument again.

"The Church of Christ, in all her parts, *claims* to be infallible.

"The Protestant Church of England *does not claim* to be infallible.

"Therefore the Church of England is not the Church of Christ.

"The ordinary mode of replying to this, would have been by denying the major, namely, that the Church in all its parts claimed to be infallible; and this would have opened the whole question of the infallibility of the Church, whether, as a whole, in the Church general, or in a part, as the Church of England. I felt, however, in my secret soul, that there was another mode of dealing with it. I had in years long past pondered the matter well and thoughtfully, and many years' experience and research alike confirmed my feeling. I had never expressed it in private, nor had I employed it in public; and I thought that the present was an occasion the most fitting possible to advance it . . . So after some moments' pause for reflection, I requested my opponent to repeat and kindly write his syllogism on paper.

"He wrote it as follows:—

"The Church of Christ, in all her parts, claim to be infallible.

"The Church of England does not claim to be infallible.

"Therefore the Church of England is no part of the Church of Christ.

"Having read it carefully, I drew my pen over the word 'England', in the minor and in the conclusion, and writing the word 'Rome' in its stead, I returned the paper as my answer. It was as follows:—

"The Church of Christ, in all her parts, claims to be infallible.

"The Church of Rome does not claim to be infallible.

"Therefore the Church of Rome is not part of the Church of Christ.

"On handing it to him in this altered form, I remarked quietly, that if his syllogism was legitimate as against the Church of England, it

must be equally legitimate against the Church of Rome; and that, therefore, he could not deny its conclusiveness.

"The moment he read it he laughed heartily but good-humouredly at me, and said the Church of Rome did claim infallibility; and expressed surprise at my minor, containing a statement so palpably incorrect, and, therefore, so easily confuted. His companion joined him in his merriment, and they both seemed to rejoice in a victory so easily and so completely gained.

"I was in no other degree affected by this, than to feel thankful that it gave me a little space to collect myself, and to express my argument with precision; I therefore calmly reminded my friends, that the Church of Rome had never, on any occasion, asserted her own infallibility; that some of her members, and some of her advocates, some of her individual divines had, without any authority from her, claimed and asserted it for her, and in her name; but that she had never, in any form whatever, either claimed or asserted it herself."—pp. 140—146.

The result was, that when the two professors were at length brought to give their proofs for the assumption that their Church asserted her own infallibility, they entirely broke down, and the honours of the day remained with their opponent.

Now, we have no doubt, that many of our readers will share the astonishment of the two Jesuits in finding any man bold enough to say that the Church of Rome does not authoritatively teach the doctrine of the existence of an infallible tribunal. We hear so much of infallibility; it is so regularly made the turning point in controversy between members of one communion and the other—so much is made to depend upon it by all Romanists whom we have to do with, that we are inclined to look upon it as an absurd paradox to dispute whether the Church of Rome asserts such a privilege. We might share in this feeling, had it not been our fortune many years since to be led to investigate very carefully this very point; and we can assure the reader that if the question is to be decided by an appeal to any of the authorized formularies of the Church of Rome—any of those formularies which they hold *binding* on them, the *Church of Rome herself* does not make the claim. There is nothing about it in the Canons or Decrees of Trent, or in the Creed of Pope Pius, or in the decrees of any general synod, or in any definition of faith made by the Pope, and received unanimously by the Roman Catholic Episcopate. It is merely the assertion of their divines and controversialists.

We cannot sufficiently testify our sense of the ability displayed by Mr. Seymour in this disputation. One such point as he has here made, is enough to confer value on his work. It is, in our opinion, a work of distinguished merit.

We must just produce one more passage in which the attempts to establish the position denied by Mr. Seymour are described.

"After some moments' pause, he said he could produce several instances, and named the Council of Constance, the Council of Basil, the Council of Florence, and several other lesser authorities. I knew each of the decrees to which he referred; and therefore when he said that one asserted the supremacy of the Church of Rome, as the mother and mistress of all Churches; and that another held that every soul was subject to the Roman Pontiff at the peril of his salvation; and that others still asserted, that every man must be obedient, and owed obedience to the successor of St. Peter; and others, again, that it belonged to the Church of Rome to interpret Holy Scripture: when he said all this, I reminded him that all this was beside the real question, was nothing to the real point before us; that my assertion was, that no received decree or bull, or other authoritative document of the Church of Rome, claimed *infallibility;* and that he answered me only by producing some which claimed *supremacy* and *authority*.

"He said that supremacy and authority implied infallibility. I answered by an emphatic—No! I said, that in England we felt that the law of the land was supreme and authoritative; that we often felt that a specified law was a bad law;—a mischievous law, a law that ought never to have been enacted, and ought immediately to be repealed; . . . but, though we ascribe to the law, and to the legislative power of the nation, a *supremacy* and *authority*, we prove, by our efforts to repeal the obnoxious law, that we do not ascribe *infallibility* to it. I then said, that all the decrees, bulls, canons, &c., to which he referred me, only asserted such a supremacy and authority as demanded the subjection and obedience of men to the Church of Rome, or to the Pope as its head; but not one of them claimed or asserted infallibility for any party.

"My opponent here did not deny the principle I had thus laid down; but he seemed puzzled and perplexed, at finding that all his documents failed in the precise point of asserting infallibility. He referred to several others which he had not already named; but in a moment gave them up as inadequate."—pp. 147, 148.

The Professor of Canon Law, on this, asked with much warmth, whether Protestants were not always in the habit of finding fault with the Church of Rome for assuming infallibility, and whether this alone was not a sufficient proof that she really did claim infallibility? To this Mr. Seymour replied, that he had never taken that ground—that he believed she had, as a Church, never advanced the claim—that her advocates did so for her; but that they were not the Church; that if he was wrong in this statement, his opponents could produce the canon or authoritative document which contained that claim,—that by the terms of the conference nothing was to be imputed to a Church except what was contained in its authoritative documents; that, as they had been

unable to produce the authority for their statement, he had a right to argue on their principles, that the Church of Rome, *not claiming to be infallible*, was no part of the Church of Christ.

Duns Scotus himself could not have argued more acutely than this. It is really admirable; and we can well imagine the utter confusion of the two Jesuits. They could not possibly have been prepared for such a turn of the argument, which is perfectly original. And it is based on undeniable facts. In this instance we see the extreme importance of not making *unnecessary concessions*. Ninety-nine people out of a hundred would have been so inconsiderate as to concede at once that the Church of England admits herself to be fallible; but when it comes to strict reasoning and clear statement, it is impossible to find any such position in the Articles and other authoritative documents of the Church. And when the question was restricted to these, the Romanist entirely failed in his argument, because Mr. Seymour understood his ground exactly. And the excellent point made about the Romish claim to infallibility is another instance of the importance of weighing well the concessions that are made. If Mr. Seymour had not detected the errors and fallacy involved in these positions, he could have been at once defeated.

We must now pass on to a subsequent conversation on the subject of infallibility, which appears to us of considerable importance in showing the way of managing controversies of that kind. The conference referred to was held with the reverend Professor of Canon Law in the Collegio Romano, and a Jesuit of eminence. It was held with a view to inquire into the means or test by which an infallible bull or decree of the Pope could be distinguished from a fallible one—to distinguish a decision *ex cathedrâ*, from one *non ex cathedrâ*. The conversation began by reference to a former conversation with a third person, who had endeavoured to persuade Mr. Seymour to receive the doctrine of an infallible tribunal without proof or inquiry. Mr. Seymour remarked to the Professor, that *supposing* infallibility to exist either in a council or a pope, he was disposed to think that if it existed in either, the weight of argument seemed to preponderate in favour of the pope, because all the texts referred to in proof of infallibility have connexion with Peter, and therefore refer much more naturally to the popes, as the successors of Peter, than to councils, which are not in any way connected with these words.

This was a bait which the Jesuit swallowed with eagerness, being instantly under the impression that our author was in a fair way to become a convert. Mr. Seymour then proceeded to lay before him certain difficulties in respect to the question, on the hypothesis that infallibility resided in the papacy

—his difficulty was how to discern a fallible decision from an infallible one.

"I reminded the Professor that he was, of course, aware that the popes were not always—were not *at all times, and under all circumstances*, infallible—that Pope Liberius had avowed Arianism, and that Pope Honorius was a Monothelite."

The Professor attempted to defend these popes from the imputation of heresy; but ended by saying that if their decisions had been *ex cathedrâ*, they would have been infallible.

"This at once conducted our conversation to the precise point which I felt most anxious to open, and I saw that there could be no difficulty in entering on it; but I desired much to do so, without any appearance of a controversial spirit on my part . . . . I said that supposing the pope to be infallible whenever he uttered a decision, or issued a bull *ex cathedrâ*, it was still necessary to know how we are to ascertain a decision *ex cathedrâ* from a decision *non ex cathedrâ*.

"He at once met the difficulty, and said that it was of very easy solution. He stated that there were certain requisites, certain essentials, which were characteristic of a bull *ex cathedrâ*. . . . . He added that those requisites or essentials were seven in number, and that he feared to weary me by their detail, but that otherwise he would be happy to enter on them."—pp. 161—164.

The conference then turned on the requisite conditions of a decision *ex cathedrâ*—an infallible decision.

The first condition was that the pope should have opened a communication with the bishops before composing and publishing his bull, asking their prayers to God that he might be infallibly guided. By thus doing, the pope could obtain the prayers of his universal Church for his assistance before forming and publishing his decision.

"I asked him how, seeing that there was a necessity for this previous communication on the part of the pope with the bishops, how I was to inform myself, that this requisite or essential had been really borne in mind. He merely replied, that *it was very easy to be ascertained*, and then proceeded to the second particular."—p. 165.

This is really almost too good. The coolness of the Jesuit in thus passing over this home thrust, is truly characteristic. It carries internal evidence of truth. . . . . Our author, however, did not press him on the point; but allowed the conversation to pass to the second condition.

This second condition was, that the pope before giving his decision should seek carefully all possible information on the

subject, especially he should seek information from persons residing in the district affected by the opinion in question.

"I asked, in reference to this, how I was to be assured that the pope was thus rightly and fully informed,—that he had sought and obtained the required information, and was thus capacitated for proceeding to issue the bull. He replied, as before, that *there was not the least difficulty in ascertaining this*, and so passed on to the other particular."—p. 166.

It must have been one of the richest scenes in the world. We wonder most at Mr. Seymour's command of countenance. The next particular is also capital.

The Professor remarked, that there was a further requisite—namely, the bull should be formal and authoritative, and claim to be authoritative; that it should be issued not merely as a decision of the pope in his mere personal capacity, but in his official capacity, as the head of the Church.

"I remarked, that this requisite could be easily ascertained, as it must necessarily appear on the face of the bull; the only difficulty being to obtain a *true copy* of the bull."

The next condition—that the bull should be addressed to all the bishops of the universal Church, was also admitted as a test of easy application, inasmuch as the *mere superscription* of the bull would at once show whether this essential was forthcoming. The succeeding condition was, that the bull should be universally received, or accepted and promulgated by the bishops of the universal Church as an authoritative and infallible decision, or at least accepted tacitly and without opposition. The reply to this was, that this was a point very difficult to be ascertained; that some bulls are received in some Romish countries and not received in others, and contradictory assertions are made, that it would open out a great field of inquiry and disputation. The Professor again said, "*there was not the least difficulty!*"

The succeeding condition was, that the bull should be a decision on some question touching faith or morals; on which it was observed, that an opinion prevailed in England that the Church of Rome had strained faith and morality to include matters of fact, or even matters of history, and that this was practically illustrated in the case of the Jansenists and Jesuits, when the point at issue was a matter of fact.

"The final condition was, that the pope should be free, and under no external compulsion or influence.

"On this I remarked, quietly, that it would be very difficult for me, or for any one in England, to ascertain to any thing like moral certainty, whether the pope, at the issuing of any bull, was really under

any exterior influence, or whether he was perfectly free. I did not see how it was possible to have any certainty on such a point. He said, as before, that there was *no real difficulty in this*, or in any of the tests he had specified; and merely added, that these several essentials or requisites were the tests by which any bull was to be tried. If they existed, then the bull was *ex cathedrâ*, and was to be received as infallible; but if any of them were wanting, then the bull was not *ex cathedrâ*."—pp. 169, 170.

Our author then expressed his obligation to the Jesuit for all this information, and sought for the explanation of a difficulty which presented itself to his mind. He spoke of the difficulty which persons resident in England might have in ascertaining whether the pope had asked for the prayers of the universal Church; had sought and obtained the necessary information; and whether his bull had been really received and promulgated universally; and he suggested that plain and unlearned men in England might find the necessary inquiries on these subjects not only difficult, but absolutely impossible. And the difficulty would be increased a thousand-fold when the inquiry concerned some bull issued some centuries ago.

"He replied, that all that was necessary for any man in such cases was to go to his bishop, ask the bishop respecting the bull in question, and the bishop would inform him whether it was *ex cathedrâ* or otherwise. Nothing could be easier."—p. 171.

Our author admitted that there was no difficulty whatever in such a mode of resolving the doubt; but he intimated that an English mind could not refer the decision of such historical facts as the pope's freedom from influence, &c., to the mere opinion of a bishop who possessed no infallibility; that an Englishman would, in such a case, prefer to compare the bull at once with the Scriptures, and so decide on its truth or error.

"He laughed at me for this, and said that an appeal to the Scriptures was absurd and impossible. It might all be very well, comparatively, for men like himself and me, who were well read and versed in sacred literature; but it was quite otherwise with men in general, and especially with humble and illiterate or ignorant men, in fact, with the great mass of mankind. For, he argued in a tone of great confidence,—his whole face lighted up with the expression of conscious triumph,—the Holy Scriptures are a volume that requires many preliminary inquiries before it can be received. In the first place, it will be necessary for the man to ascertain the authenticity of every separate book or portion of the volume. In the next place, it will be necessary for him to prove the divine inspiration of every part of it. In the third place, the book is written in dead languages, and the man

must know how to understand them, or have them translated. In the fourth place, it is a volume that has given rise to different meanings or interpretations, and the man should be able to judge upon these . . . so the Holy Scriptures can never be made a fitting volume for such a man to appeal to in matters of religion."—p. 173.

This is the well-known system of argument adopted by all Romish controversialists. One might suppose oneself dealing with an Infidel or a Rationalist. The arguments of such opponents of religion against the Scripture are unscrupulously borrowed by Romanists. But Mr. Seymour was a match for the Jesuit.

"I began by stating that . . . I apprehended his method of argument would be met in England in a very effective way, at least in such a way as I should be unable to answer, unless he informed me further than he had as yet done. I said that the most ordinary and commonplace man in England would say, that if they forsook the volume of the Holy Scriptures for the volume of the papal bulls—that if they exchanged the Bible for the bullarium, they could gain no advantage thereby; for if, as he had said, there was a necessity for a man to ascertain the authority of each book in the Holy Scripture, before he could avail himself of it, then it was no less true that it was equally necessary for a man to ascertain the much-questioned authenticity of each bull in the bullarium—that if, as he had alleged, the man must be carefully informed by study in the inspiration of the Sacred Volume, before receiving it as his Divine teacher, there will exist a similar necessity for his being informed by study in the disputed infallibility of the papal bullarium, before receiving it as his infallible instructor; that if, as he had averred, the Holy Scriptures were written in the dead languages, and a man must learn to translate them before using them: the very same may be averred against the papal bulls, which also are all written in a dead language, and a man must learn to translate them before appealing to them; that if, as he had argued, the Holy Scriptures have been variously interpreted by various men, and all that variety must be resolved by every man before he makes the Sacred Volume his guide, it might, in like manner, be argued that the papal bulls have been variously explained, some received and some rejected by a vast variety of persons, and men must be able to decide on all these varying interpretations of bulls, before accepting them as an infallible guide—in short, it would be argued,—fairly argued, by men of no pretension to any thing but the possession of common sense, that every objection he urged against the volume of the Holy Scripture, was liable to be urged against the volume of the papal bulls. They were written in a dead language. They were the subject of various interpretations. They were the source of endless controversies. Their number and names were doubtful. Their title to infallibility was questioned. All men disputed as to which were fallible and which infallible. Some bulls

were directly contradictory of others; some actually and by name were condemnatory of others; some were admitted on all hands to be erroneous and heretical; and the whole combined constituted a series of volumes almost as extended as a library, and therefore wholly inaccessible to the masses of a Christian population. They could never become the guide of a Christian people, and to this day have never yet been translated into the language of any Christian Church. While the Holy Scriptures, on the other hand, were universally translated, were small in size, convenient for reference, and incomparably more easy to be read, studied, and understood, than the endless intricacies and scholastic niceties of the bullarium. I said that men in England would argue thus, and would feel that they should lose rather than gain by exchanging their Bible for the bullarium—the Holy Scriptures for the papal bulls."

Of course there was no answering this. It is absolutely unanswerable as a reply to Romanists. It retorts their argument on themselves most triumphantly. And the very same principle may be applied to the decrees of councils, and to the monuments of tradition in general—to the liturgies—the canons—the writings of the fathers. If the Romanist asserts in controversy with us, that the Scriptures cannot be a rule of faith or settle controversies, or that it is altogether impossible for men generally to appeal to them, because they must first ascertain their genuineness, authenticity, correctness of translation, and true interpretation, on all of which there are endless disputes—our reply at once may be, that by the very same mode of argument it may be proved that the canons and decrees of all synods, including the Synod of Trent—the decrees of popes—the monuments of tradition in all ages down to the present moment are equally unfit to be appealed to in any matters of controversy. So that, in fine, the Romanist so completely overreaches himself in his struggle to subvert our position, that he is, on his own principles, left without a single proof that his Church holds any article of faith or morality whatever. He *will* not allow Scripture to settle the question. He *cannot*, therefore, allow councils, fathers, liturgies, canons, bulls, to settle the question. So that, in regard to all doctrines of the faith, he is without compass or guide of any kind, except it may be the dictum of his particular priest or bishop, whom he himself admits and must admit to be *fallible*. Thus, according to the principles laid down by Romanists themselves, they are bound to be in doubt on every point of their creed. They have no authority for believing the Apostles' Creed, or the Nicene Creed, or the Creed of Pope Pius itself.

This is evident and certain beyond all manner of doubt; and it amounts, of course, to a demonstration of the unsoundness and

absurdity of the leading and most popular argument employed by Romanists. For a full exposition of the way in which it is possible most briefly and successfully to meet the current argument on this point we are indebted to Mr. Seymour. His mode of treating the subject is not only valuable in its matter but in its manner. The quiet mastery which he exercises—the way in which he works up his adversary to the point he wants, and then pounces upon him, is admirable. We really know nothing of the kind in modern books. It reminds us more of the tact and ingenuity of Bossuet than of any one else that we recollect.

Mr. Seymour touches on all the popular arguments now in vogue at Rome; amongst the rest, on the subject of the alleged sterility of Protestant missions as compared with the success of those of the Church of Rome.

"In arguing for the Church of Rome, and against the Church of England, he (the Jesuit) stated that Providence was every day setting the seal of testimony to the former, and withholding it from the latter. He said that this was peculiarly visible in the department of missions; for that while the missionary labours of the Church of England, notwithstanding the commanding influence and wealth of England, are without any success that deserved the name, the preaching of the missionaries of the Church of Rome had met with the most wonderful successes,—that the multitudes of heathen who were converted of late years are beyond expression. . . . .

"I replied that I had not much faith in the statements sometimes put forth on the subject of missions. I mentioned the narrative of a friend of my own, who was witness to the conversion of a whole tribe of American Indians. He told me the whole tribe marched down to a river, and that the Roman Catholic priest, without a word of instruction, sprinkled water on every one in the usual form; and that he then hung a little cross by a string around the neck of each, and telling them they were now Christians, he left them. My friend told me that the Indians departed precisely as they came—heard no preaching—received no instruction—exhibited no sign of Christianity—made no profession of any faith—and departed precisely as they came; as naked, as savage, as wild and as ignorant, and heathen, with this only difference, that each had a little cross suspended around his neck! I added, that I fully believed the statement of my informant, who would not deceive me; and, that I did not see how the Church of Rome could triumph much in such alleged conversions. . . . .

"He said I was altogether mistaken, in doubting the reality of these conversions—that it was in this the interposition of God was so clearly manifested—that these conversions partook very much of the miraculous in their nature, at least could not be accounted for often, unless on the principle of a Divine miracle. . . . . These very Indians, heathen and savage as they had been, were real converts; and the proofs

of the reality of their conversion are undoubted and convincing; so much so, that after the missionary had left them, after he had remained absent for two years, . . . after he returned to his missionary station, at the close of these two years, and came again among these Indians, he, of course, as was his duty, required of them to come to confession—to confess their sins that they might receive absolution; he was equally surprised and indeed overjoyed to find that not one of them had any sins to confess! My friend went on to explain, that there was no *matter* for the sacrament of penance, as during these two years the Indians lived such converted lives, such holy and Christian lives, *that there was not one among them who had committed a single sin, and therefore had no sin to confess*, and the missionary priest was unable to confer absolution, inasmuch as there was no *matter* for the sacrament!"

Our author ventured to suggest, that as the very best and holiest Christians were always conscious of sin, it might possibly be, that these Indians were ignorant of Christian truth, and might not be aware of the nature of sin, or that the acts of vice and immorality they were in the habit of committing *were* sin.

"This suggestion he rejected, and flung from him at once; and he eagerly added, that the very missionary was now at Rome—that he had just returned from America, and was at the Collegio Romano, where he had himself heard him narrate the facts; and, as a proof beyond question of the reality of the conversions, and the holiness of the Indians, he mentioned what he called a most wonderful miracle that had occurred when the missionary was administering the holy communion to them. He was holding the host in his fingers thus—my friend suiting the action to the word—and as the poor Indian was too far from him, the missionary priest could not place the host in his mouth: the poor, humble, devout Indian knelt so far away that the priest could not reach him, and—here my reverend friend lifted his hands in an attitude of awe, looked devoutly to heaven, and then earnestly and solemnly addressed me—the host flew out of his fingers, flew over to the poor Indian, and flew into his mouth! 'Oh!' he added, in a tone of the most reverential devotion, 'the blessed Lord Jesus so loved that poor savage, that he longed to enter into his heart, and thus miraculously flew into his mouth! How anxious he was to get into him!'

"I could no longer doubt the sincerity of this priest. There was a fervour, an earnestness, a devotion of manner, that showed he fully believed what he thus narrated; and the personal character of the man was such that I had no right to doubt him after so solemn a statement. He narrated it as a miracle wrought by God on behalf of the Church of Rome. . . . It only proved to my mind, that the missionary priest had wickedly invented this story to exalt and magnify his own labours, and was now telling it among his brother Jesuits of the Collegio Romano, that such of them as were simple and credulous, and superstitious enough to believe it, might spread it through the world, as a new testimony of God to the Church of Rome."—pp. 190—194.

The extracts we have made will be a sufficient specimen of Mr. Seymour's work. We have perused this work with some attention, and we think it, on the whole, better calculated for circulation by the parochial clergy than any book we know of. It is exactly such a book as might be useful to lend to Romanists, or to persons wavering in their religious tenets and inclining towards Rome. There is nothing in it to offend the fastidious delicacy of the present day. Where there is irony, it is so fine, and so much subdued by Christian charity, that the most sensitive mind cannot be displeased. The work takes notice of all the arguments most dwelt on by the Jesuits, and reproduced for the benefit of the English by Wiseman and others. There is a very useful and interesting discussion of the question of the sepulchral inscriptions on the tombs of the early Christians discovered in the catacombs, from which Wiseman and others have attempted to establish the early date of certain Romish practices. This branch of the discussion is very well treated by Mr. Seymour in the latter part of the work before us. It has also been most satisfactorily and ably treated by Dr. Maitland (*not* the author of the "Dark Ages") in his very interesting volume on the "Church in the Catacombs;" and we trust that, after the exposure which these able writers have made of the whole system of theorizing on the subject of the ancient monuments in the catacombs, we shall hear no more of the matter. The truth is, that the early Christian monuments furnish, in themselves, a strong presumptive proof that the invocation of saints and purgatory were unknown to the early Roman Christians, as Mr. Seymour and Dr. Maitland have both shown.

The facts stated in Mr. Seymour's volume, with regard to the worship of the Virgin and the saints in Italy, are very striking and useful. He remarks—and every one who has been in Italy must at once concur in the truth and justice of the remark—that the religion in Italy is rather the "religion of the Virgin," than "the religion of Jesus Christ." Our Lord is placed, with reference to the Virgin, in much the same position that Brahma occupies with reference to the inferior deities in Hindostan. His superior deity is acknowledged in theory; but he has no temples, and receives no worship; while the inferior gods, acknowledged to be mortal, absorb all the offerings and all the attention of the Hindoo worshipper. So it is in Italy, where application is for the most part made to the "Queen of Heaven" (as she is impiously called), who is believed to have the power of "commanding" the second person of the ever blessed Trinity to intercede with the Father for our sins. Indeed, as she is considered regularly as the "spouse" of the Almighty Father, and to have been selected for that dignity simply on account of her transcendent and infinite

merit, surpassing that of all created beings, it follows that the intercession of the "Queen of Angels," or "Queen of Heaven," must be of infinite avail with the "King of Heaven;" and what practical distinction can thus be drawn between the merits and intercession of Jesus Christ and of Mary we know not. So that we need not wonder when we find her, equally with Jesus, the object of worship—addressed in the same terms—placed fully on an equality with Him. The only real matter of astonishment is, that Romish controversialists and others in this country can put forth the statements they do, in reference to the worship of the Virgin and saints, which they represent as limited simply to asking for their *prayers to God*, in the same way that we ask the prayers of our fellow men for us. And in order to convince unwary inquirers that this is the case, they produce *some* of their books of devotion, which are moderate in their language with reference to the Virgin and saints, and comprise prayers to God; and then, they enlarge upon the "wickedness" of those who impute to them any worship or addresses which invest creatures with the attributes of the Creator.

We must now take our leave of Mr. Seymour's work, which we should be glad to see printed in a *very cheap* form, and circulated by tens of thousands. If he could give us a brief defence of the Church of England, as a branch of the Catholic Church of Christ, against Romish attacks, in as popular a style, with as *judicious a title*, and in shape as inoffensive to the feelings, and tastes, and principles of Churchmen, as the work before us, he would confer an incalculable benefit on the Church.

Art. III.—*A Few Words to Parish Schoolmasters.* London: Cleaver.

If it was ever questioned that the next most important personage in a parish after the clergyman is the schoolmaster, that question exists no longer. The clergy feel how much their whole work depends upon that branch of it which is carried on in the schoolroom, and therefore upon those who are mainly instrumental in conducting it. There does not appear, however, to be the same unanimity of opinion as to what the schoolmaster should be. That he must do a great deal, and be a great deal, is admitted; but the limits of his work, and the requisite characteristics of the workman, are hardly determined, and we find great inequality in the estimation and treatment of this personage. Clearly there will be always considerable variety of practice, arising not only from the difference of different men's views, but also from the various wants of parishes and capabilities of masters. More or less will be put into the hands of the master, as he is found capable or incapable of high trust, and as the size of the parish renders the clergyman more or less able himself to educate the school. This last cause of variety will, however, probably decrease: for the progressive increase of services, and, still more, the demand for closer spiritual intercourse and counsel on the part of the older parishioners will absorb so much of the time and powers of the clergy, that not many parishes will bear to have a schoolmaster who requires the constant presence and complement of the parish priest. The schoolmaster must be a person to be depended upon; and it is now before the clergy, first to make up their minds upon what they wish to depend—what sort of masters they desire to have, and then to see about obtaining the object of their wishes.

Now it is not at all clear, that we are better prepared to fix the schoolmaster's character at this time, than we were some years ago. It is true that training institutions, some of them most admirable, set themselves to produce not only a more clever, well-informed class of teachers, but one which shall be better disciplined and more religious. None of the clergy but desire this result, and rejoice in the machinery prepared for the purpose of

producing it; but as the nearness of the poles affects the best compass, so there is an influence at work both on the clergy and on their schoolmasters, which disturbs their calm judgment and purpose, and clogs the machinery in its action, or mars the work when completed—the influence, the pressure of *intellectual education*. So much is expected of the master when he leaves his college, that all is anxiety and toil to prepare him. To make him a well-informed teacher, an intelligent, decided, prompt, orderly governor and superintendent; to fit him to pass the examination, and to obtain pupil teachers; these are matters of such overwhelming interest, that in him or in his teachers, or in both, something of the first high aim and intention is often unconsciously lost sight of; a higher standard is attained in things mental than was previously wished, and a lower in things spiritual than had been hoped and desired. Then afterwards, when the master has gone forth into the world, after his short three years of preparation, the pressure weighs upon him still more heavily. He stands alone. The supporters of his school desiring pupil teachers, the inspector, the common feeling of those who examine and interest themselves in schools, the temptations of ambition, the fact that intellectual progress is more evident, and seems a more real and grateful return for labour, all these things urge on in one and the same direction. Nor is the clergyman exempt from the same influences. The pecuniary importance of Government aid, the comparison of his own school with other more famous schools, the satisfaction of finding his children always able to understand him, and to receive what he gives, so that he can teach without labour, and the little time he has to spare is none of it wasted; all these things help to carry him away also in the stream; to make him rejoice in a highly educated master, to make him satisfied on the whole with such a master, and with the effect of that master's teaching, although there be at times an inward disquiet and fear, as if all were not right—as if the tone and feeling of the schoolroom were not that of those whom Jesus has taken up in his arms, put his hands upon and blessed.

It would seem reasonable, then, that we should bear in mind these influences, and calculate their effect upon ourselves. It is not likely, it is not natural, that when the whole age is set upon the idolatry of mind, we should be entirely exempt; and a very little thought will personally convince us that we are not so exempt. We are all in the stream, although not all in the violence of it, and if we were to turn and row a while in the opposite direction, we should only be keeping our position.

This is one consideration, and perhaps but one other is really

wanted to enable us to answer the question, What sort of man we require for our master? that one other being simply the remembrance of what he has to do: he has to take the lambs of Christ's flock out of the arms of their parents, to bring them into contact with the harshness, the selfishness, the levity, the sinful boldness, and the sinful cowardice of numbers; he has to try their patience with learning things hard, their passions with punishments, their vanity with praises: he has to make them public, and yet keep them private; to bring forward, and yet repress; to give confidence without destroying humility; he has to teach Christianity, to impart Christianity. From him the younger children will acquire almost all they know of God, and the holy angels, and their own immortal bodies and souls; the elder children, a great portion of these, probably the greater portion; and as he is most uniformly with them, so they will generally take their tone upon these subjects from him. As he handles the Bible so will they. As is his eye, when he reads or speaks of Christ, so will be their hearts. His feeling, state of heart, and general character, will reflect itself in them. They are his mirror, only the reflection is not transient, but in a measure lasts through eternity. What possible presence of the clergyman can supply the deficiencies or remedy the evils in a person possessing such influence? Can an hour a day undo the whole of that day, except that one hour?

And, after all, what are our school children to be when their education is finished? What is the purpose of their education, but to fit them for their future life? And what will be their future life, but that of labourers, sailors, artizans, servants, small trade-people, and farmers at the very highest? Are not the real requirements of these classes of society so much knowledge, indeed, as is necessary for the several occupations, but chiefly contentedness, cheerfulness, openness, honesty, courage, gentleness, obedience, *Christian character?*

If asked what we require in the schoolmaster, we should reply, the first qualification, the second qualification, the third qualification, is *character*—a character of reverence, thoughtfulness, right judgment, patience, affection, faith, hope, in short, of 'meekness of wisdom.'

I. Now, if our readers will go with us in this, we will proceed to apply our principle to the choice of masters of the old school, or rather to the consideration of their frequent and progressive rejection and disuse. It has been said by a person who has peculiar opportunities for forming his opinion, that the old set of masters will almost entirely fall out of employment; and probably the main hindrance to the fulfilment of this prediction, is the

present paucity of the new race. Such a result of the present educational stir would seem to us to denote something very wrong in the prevalent notion of education; neither can we even consider it either just or expedient.

It is certainly of great importance that our masters should be well educated, and better informed in several branches of education than has hitherto been usual. We rate as highly as any man, a knowledge of the history of the Church and of their country, and that of sacred music; but it is one thing evidently to desire them and other acquirements, and another to discard a master for not having them, or to value them above the moral qualities of the teacher. It may be difficult to support our schools, and impossible to justify our wishes without resorting to a new style of teacher; but, at least, we ought to counterbalance the conclusion to what their unpleasantness would lead us hastily, by remembering that the old race of masters are those whom the Church has tolerated for a length of time, nay, by their education and toleration *formed*. It would be as hard to turn round upon those men as a body and say, "You do not now meet our wants; you are not up to the present standard; and, therefore, grieved as we are to say so, we cannot employ you:" it would be as hard and unjust to say this to the schoolmaster, as it would be to the clergyman,

"Eheu,
Quam temere in nosmet legem sancimus iniquam!"

Tried by such a rule, many an incumbent must vacate the parsonage, and retire from the pulpit into the pew; for nothing is more certain than that a large body of the clergy are not only unequal, but backward to cope with the work which their generation requires to be done.

Again, it must not be forgotten, that the old race of masters possess some qualifications that the new cannot have, such as age and experience; and many may fairly be supposed to have, what some do certainly enjoy, such qualities as are acquired by time, judgment, patience, gentleness, firmness, quietness, and the like; and, moreover, they are almost sure not to be carried away by the great temptation of modern schoolmasters, into the intellectual torrent, but are from many circumstances likely to value obedience and character very highly, and, indeed, as the great objects of school training.

True, that vast numbers of the old masters will be found not possessing those faculties which they ought to have acquired; and so also will many of the new be found not what might have been expected. But these considerations should at least be taken into

account, and, as a general rule, no master not grossly ignorant and foolish, or, which is worse, careless, harsh, or irreligious, should be discarded without an effort to make him such as to render dismissal needless. We must speak guardedly, though we seem to repeat ourselves. Some masters are hopelessly unfit for their office; and others so wanting in religious character, that it would be better there should be no schools, than schools conducted by them. Still this is not always the case, nor even commonly; and wherever it is not, these considerations find place.

Generally speaking, schoolmasters have received as little personal care and guidance from the clergyman, as the squire, the farmer, and the tradesman. The poor have from their readiness to receive, ever received most largely. The barrier between the priest and the educated, or those supposed to be educated, has hitherto been almost insuperable, and is, as yet, rarely broken down. This has operated very unfavourably upon masters.

Independently of the general temptations to impatience, arbitrariness, harshness, and the like, their having to teach religion has brought them into contact with sacred things, in a peculiar and somewhat dangerous manner. The master, like the clerk and the sexton, has a religious office, and his calling, as those others just mentioned, when understood and appreciated, both elevates and sanctifies; but when not understood and appreciated, lowers, darkens, hardens, and injures deeply and permanently. We all feel this readily in the case of clerks and sextons, and similar officials. The remembrance we have of the tone of mind and the state of feeling frequent in such persons, is very painful. A little thought will probably enable us to trace the same evil and the same source of evil in our masters. The most especial powerful spiritual influence should be brought to bear upon all those so much connected with the sanctuary, so nearly approaching to the mysteries, lest by seeing they should see not, and by hearing hear not; but this influence has not been so brought to bear. From long disuse, then, there will certainly be a barrier to break down whenever such influence is attempted; and if a clergyman were to begin to treat his master as his spiritual ward, there might be some repugnance, or at the best awkwardness at the outset. But in the case of all those who are capable of improvement, this constraint and reserve would soon die out, and the assistance would be thankfully received. Indeed the scholastic deficiencies of the old masters, seem to open a new and very ready way of approach to their hearts and characters. If any clergyman had a master in *attainments* indeed below the standard required, but a man of right character, and principle, he would win his heart at once, by endeavouring to teach him what was wanting, or by

himself supplying it. The manifested desire to retain him in spite of committees or inspectors, coupled with efforts to make the retention justifiable, would open the way for gentle and progressive suggestions both as to the manner of teaching, and even upon the tone of mind of the teacher. Where such kindness fails after fair trial, there must exist some grievous fault; and we can hardly hope for a good school in the parish of such a clergyman and such a schoolmaster, rest the blame on whom it may. Here then the matter would turn, as we wished, chiefly upon a moral test. The docile would generally become fairly capable, and the sooner those who cannot or will not learn, cease to teach, the better for their pupils. Such are not the men whose cause we plead. Contending for character in masters, we should be the first to avoid those who do not possess and will not acquire. In all this we speak of course generally. We must not be supposed to assert that elderly persons can acquire music and geography, and the like attainments. All that is maintained is, that much may be done with a really pains-taking master; and that the most rigidly moulded man can learn, if willing; and if kindly treated, probably would learn a great deal as to management and system, and be corrected of very obvious faults. And then, if he can be retained by the clergyman's supplying his deficiencies, or in some cases even by submitting to those deficiencies, we hold that justice demands that it should be so, and believe that they who are thus patient, may look, in return for their forbearance, to find their schools more obedient, reverential, quiet, and well toned than they would be under many younger masters, who could carry away all the votes of modern educationalists.

II. We trust that we shall not be understood to depreciate the rising race of masters, or to be forgetful of the noble exertions of those persons and colleges who are striving to raise the standard of teachers, and who are as anxious as we can possibly be, that they should be morally as well as intellectually, equal to the task. If there is any thing polemical in what has been said, the war has simply been defensive on behalf of the old teachers of our schools, who have the first claim upon our sympathies. We now proceed to speak of the new race of teachers, and to manifest our interest in them, by drawing attention to the difficulties which beset them, and the assistance which they should receive from the clergy in seeking to overcome them.

The calling of the schoolmaster is so beset with temptations and trials, that, were St. Chrysostom to write a justification for declining the office, he would easily make out a case as strong as that which he pleaded with his friend Basil in excuse for refusing to take up the yoke of the ministry.

After an education of three years, during which he must to a considerable extent have "crammed," have acquired a little knowledge of many things, a thorough knowledge of very few, he sallies forth at the age of eighteen or nineteen a certificated master. He comes out to the world as the representative and agent of a new system of education; is considered by others to be (is it strange, then, if he partakes in the opinion?) one of a race of masters vastly superior to the old teachers, whose system, nay, whose very persons, they are destined to supersede throughout the land.

He goes forth to his school in the city or in the country; he surveys the rooms, his future domain; the children, his subjects. He is suddenly almost absolute monarch of 100 or 200 children. He is aware, indeed, that the clergyman of the parish is his superior: and once a day, for a short time, the sceptre passes out of his hands, nominally at least. If the clergyman is well informed, and decided in his views of education, or is crotchety, he is subject to having his plans altered, or even superseded; but the clergy are not often the first, and still less frequently the second. They are content in this present state of things to go by the experience of Battersea, Chelsea, and Westminster, and to leave the main system in the hands of the master. Anyhow, the master is in school from morning to night, the clergyman but for a short time. He is the sun or storm of the room; all eyes are upon him, for every thing comes from him, his will, and his temper. It was no golden age at Auburn in this respect. The iron age breathes in the iron sceptre.

> "Full well the boding tremblers learn'd to trace
> The day's disasters in his morning face."

He is a monarch or a tyrant as he chooses; or rather, as he is made by his temperament and self-management. This position is enough to turn his head, and make him peevish and arbitrary, and will do so unless other influences prevent. Add the trials to patience; the trials to hope and love in the case of the dull and wilful pupil, and the opposite temptations to vanity and partiality in that of the quick scholar who drinks in eagerly what is taught, and flatters the master by the progress he makes, and the praises which visitors bestow on him.

Then all the stimulants to intellectual education before mentioned must be remembered in addition. The temptations to get his children forward *in knowledge*, not as it acts upon the scholars, we are not now thinking of them, but as it reflects upon the master. For if once he yields to this great enemy of real education, it threatens to mar, nay, to make utterly injurious, all

the efforts of these times: it is all over with him. Circe's wand is not more transforming. When once a man is infected with this plague, every thing withers at his touch. In his hands the Bible becomes a lesson, history an examination, every thing valueless in itself. He becomes blind to character, tone, feeling; he cannot read the child's eye; he does not know its heart. His own better nature is not exercised; it does not give response, and never answering becomes dumb. The schoolroom and all in it grow to be a very perfect machine, all orderly, all working, all producing; he moves about regulating and supplying, but his heart is cold within him; he is mechanical as those whom he mechanizes; not seeking the affections of others, he has lost his own. Is this exaggeration? There is great life and interest in merely mental teaching; and those who are fond of instruction go on far into years full of youthful fire and vigour. There may be great spirit in teacher and pupil where character is forgotten, but this is not the question. What is here urged is this, that where the reason of pupils is the master's uniform object, and their hearts are overlooked, then, quick as may be his and their interest in knowledge, yet the life is gone from the best part of education; his religious teaching is mechanical, and the affections are deadened. Indeed, if this latter fault were all, this one of teaching the Bible and doctrine as a mere intellectual exercise, and of regarding religious knowledge as the end of religious teaching, remains; and nothing could be more destructive to a man.

We must remember also the great wear upon the spirits and energies, and the amount of time taken up by regular school work; and yet this is not all. The process of self-education must go on, and pupil teachers in very many cases exhaust the remaining strength and leisure of the master. Are not these trials and temptations too much for most *men*, unless they are met by strong counteracting influences and supports? how much more then for *lads!* Can we be surprised if a few years hence we find that those masters who have been left to cope with such difficulties have sunk under them, and become, what we shall not endure to have, teachers cold, hard, conceited, irreverent, secular in character and education. If our masters are hereafter found in any case a hindrance to us, if their tone of mind and their instruction are not in accordance with that of the Church, if they are of another spirit than hers, and really promoting another end, can we wonder? can we doubt the cause?

And short of this, even at this present time, it is a question whether some of the new race of masters are not already unfit either by inadequate preparation, or by subsequent operation of

hurtful influences, to produce or maintain that spirit in their schools, without which the doors should be rather closed, and the children should wander over the fields. Our meaning will appear more clearly, by considering the formation of character in a school collective and personal. By character, we mean habits of truth, openness, generosity, kindness, reverence, obedience, and the like; and these, since with us character is Christian or irreligious, these graces based upon religious grounds, strengthened, sanctified, and in practice connected with the position and creed of a child of God. It is impossible to say how much children depend in the growth of their character upon that of their teachers. The child learns by the heart, by fine perceptions and feelings: it is not influenced by reasoning, nor by what is taught so much as by what is done; nor by either teaching or doing so much as by the manner and spirit of that teaching and doing. The child's eye watches the master's eye, and its ear listens to the tone of his voice. It estimates the justice and fitness of a punishment by the spirit in which that punishment seems to be administered. It knows whether idleness is visited as a sin, or as a bar to progress; whether quarrelling is in the master's estimation a breach of discipline or of love. The child knows when it is taught the history of Joseph, whether its teacher desires it to *know* that history or to *feel* it. The very manner in which the Bible is taken into the hand, opened, held, laid down, all is marked. And as are these things in the master, so are they generally in the school. A reverent, thoughtful, affectionate, open-hearted, trustworthy set of scholars are, as a rule, only to be found under a master who has these qualities. The scholar *learns* what the master *is*. No words, no rules suffice. Character alone produces character.

But the private treatment of scholars is of very great importance. The great fault of home education is its absence of probation, and its keeping the young so much the special objects of care as to cause vanity and selfishness. The great fault of school, a fault so great that it has counterbalanced all advantages, is the merging the young so much in masses, without adequate strengthening and protecting influences, that they sail in the general flood, that they sin without repentance, try to rise without support, become hardened and selfish, have little confidence in and less affection for their teachers. This great and crying evil all earnest teachers are now endeavouring to remedy by private and personal guidance. After every punishment except those of the most trivial character, there should be private admonition. Repentance should be produced, and then sustained. Faults such as slyness, unkindness, vanity, cowardice,

irreverence, should be the subject of private warning and advice. Other faults capable of public notice require private also. Serious rebuke and caution should be given from time to time to those who are thought trying to amend; they should be told of the fruitless branch cut off, and of the polluted temple at last deserted. Affectionate encouragement should be applied to those who are trying to amend; rules of conduct and devotion supplied for their assistance. It should be ascertained what prayers a child uses, how regularly, in what position, and the like. It is as important for teachers systematically to have private intercourse with their scholars, as it is for a clergyman to visit in the cottage as well as seen in the church. The happiest consequences may be anticipated from such pastoral care of children, great safety from sin, great growth in grace, humbly and carefully undertaken, and watchfully and steadily discharged. Systematic private intercourse with the children of the upper classes is of vast importance; and this intercourse, although so priestly in its character, yet must ordinarily devolve upon their schoolmaster, as well because he is the representative of the parents, as because the clergy have seldom either time for the work, or that individual knowledge of the character and conduct of the scholars, which would be necessary for the advantageous discharge of the duty.

What sort of men, then, are required for this work,—how affectionate, how thoughtful, how reverent, how sympathizing they should be, is only so plain, that perhaps many clergymen would be afraid to let their masters undertake it, necessary as it is, and incapable of being performed by others. Far, far better nothing should be done than that most delicate work of God, the conscience of a child, should be rudely handled and tampered with. The public and private training of character in children depends upon character in the master, and that in a very high and Christian sense. But will it not be hard to obtain men possessing this character, after so short a training as most masters can rarely receive, a training influenced more or less by the popular notions of education, and issuing in a course beset by such a host of trials and temptations to vanity and secularity? We require men of singular firmness and wisdom, not of the spirit of this world, nor of this age, whilst the prevalent system not only does not awaken them to the necessity of being such, but, when of themselves, they endeavour after higher things, thwarts them, casts them down, and almost by force makes them that which they would not be.

The remedy, so far as there is one, seems to lie very much in the hands of the parochial clergy. No conscientious incumbent thrusts the deacon, to whom he has given a title, into all the

temptations and difficulties of ministerial work, without counsel, support, and guidance. Yet no deacon but has had a longer education than the master, and twenty-three is the earliest age at which he can commence his calling. What is done, then, for the young clergyman, should be done for the young schoolmaster. A friend and guide should be ever ready to correct, encourage, and instruct. We are not speaking so much of guidance in school-work. The young master will often be as well acquainted with the system of a school, and with good modes of teaching, as the clergyman, and, not unfrequently, better. We have in mind, rather, the guidance of the master himself, of his studies, his manner of life, his tastes and character. The clergy should be ready to point out and supply those books which they see their masters severally require. They should explain difficulties, converse upon the views contained in them, modifying or extending them as required. The schoolmaster ought to know his way well to the clergyman's study. Kindly intercourse should be added. It need not be familiar or level, but still kindly; such as shall soothe after the labours of one day, strengthen for that of another, and win trust and regard. The evening meal at times, and the walk, together with conversation on the parish and such matters of ecclesiastical and national interest as are common to all thinking sons of the Church, should not be omitted. In such ways, and on such occasions, suggestions on minor points might come in, so as to be, without effort, given and received. And especial pains should be taken to prevent the deadening and superficializing effects of school routine in religious teaching, by a continual supply of deep and hidden truth. The inward Christian meaning of the events of Old Testament history, the interior lessons of parable, miracle, and action in the Life of the Saviour, should be drawn out. The clergyman should give the heart and sweetness of the fruit to him who is necessarily so much occupied with the shell and surface. Choice interpretations of the elder Christians, beautiful and favourite thoughts and views from the Fathers and best divines might be pointed out from time to time, and enlarged on; and such intercourse rendered a continual refreshment and advance.

And more than this: a strictly pastoral office should be exercised. The master is, indeed, not only a master, but a coadjutor and friend; yet is he also a parishioner. He should be spiritually directed. His own habits of mind should be the subject of watchful guardianship. Hastiness or sloth, hardness or too great softness, want of reverence or scrupulousness, should receive their medicine from a kind and gentle hand. He who

feeds the tender lambs, should not himself be destitute of pastoral care.

And as the priest and the master are, together, the great human instrument of truth and godliness in their parish, so their labours should be united, not only in principle, and system, and feeling, but in that best bond of unity, common worship, special worship in relation to a special work. It would be well, perhaps, for the clergy to do for their masters, what some or many do for their assistants—pray with them; have certain set times for a short service of admonition and supplication relating to the common work of folding and feeding the lambs of the flock of Christ.

We cannot believe that such intercourse would make the master forget his position, or think more highly of himself than he ought to think. On the contrary, it would rest upon the recognition of the spiritual authority and superiority of the clergyman. Neither do we fear that our masters will overstretch their work in a religious point of view. The vanity and ambition which endangers them is secular, comes from the pride of reason and the inventions of man: and the more they recognize themselves as a kind of order in the Church, as religious officers, the more sensible will they become of their real subordination.

The clergy must not fear intercourse as lowering to themselves or exalting to others. The reason why the farmer and the upper tradesman is proud and presuming, is not because the clergy are familiar with them, but strange. They lift themselves up because the clergy do not condescend. They stand on a basis of their own, and are proud of having parochial influence independent of their rector, because they feel separated from him. Where cordiality thrives, rivalry dies. So with the master: if he loves and trusts; if he is rendered sensible of the need and advantage of spiritual counsel and guidance, he will not set up an independent authority, nor wish a private glory.

These practical suggestions may, perhaps, serve for the present. The future is uncertain. The whole prospects of education are uncertain. And it is impossible to foresee whether or not our masters will eventually be admitted to the deaconate, a measure possessed of great advantages, both to the clergy and to them, if properly guarded and restricted, both as to admission, and direction, and function; and already partially and not unsuccessfully adopted in one diocese. The difficulties which lie in the way of such an advance, are principally those connected with the character of the master; and, therefore, the line now recommended, by guarding and raising that character, would serve alike

to prepare for a further development, or to improve the working of the existing system.

We have almost forgotten to direct attention to the really excellent tract which we have mentioned at the head of this article, and which has in fact drawn our attention at this moment to the deeply important subject on which we have been writing. The tract is addressed to Parish Schoolmasters, and deserves attentively to be weighed by them. The following passage expresses with much truth and reality the idea which we have been endeavouring to develop :—

" My heart sinks within me at times when I go into a well-worked school, see the order, quickness, promptitude of all; behold proofs of the quantity of work done in it, and of the knowledge acquired; and then only look at the children's faces and hear them read. Their very tone and manner is enough. There is a catchy, hard, selfish, irreverent, worldly manner, which springs from a corresponding spirit. The scholars appear and speak like little merchants on Change, all eager indeed and business-like and alive for their own interest; but the one thing is wanting, a child-like heart. This which they once had, their best possession, is taken away from them by their very friends. I call a child-like heart God's presence in a school; and when I find it not, the place seems to me forsaken, deserted as a ruined Church. Thus our lambs are turned into wolves even in the fold and under the shepherd's eye: that which is soft, sweet and good is taken away, that which is their own; and whilst childhood's weakness of resolve and quick desires are left, the hard ways of mid-life, its isolation and selfishness, its cold, insensible reception of solemn and moving thoughts, are given them in exchange.

" Against such mischief I know no safeguard except the firm belief so often mentioned, that character is all in all; a belief rooted in the teacher and grown up, and filling his whole mind and actions. Only feel and be sure, and then your scholars will feel also, that *how* they do, in what spirit they do that which they do, is all-important; then they will see that you value a thoughtful answer more than a clever one, a patient and industrious disposition more than showy talents; that openness, kindness, truthfulness, are the qualities which lead you to single any from their fellows; that you had rather they never took a book in their hands than learn jealousy and vanity by it; had rather they could not read their Bibles at all than read them without reverence and solemnity.

" But the pastoral care, the personal and individual observation and treatment of your children, will be one of your greatest assistants. Perhaps you may not hitherto have looked at your school in this light; but it is well for you to regard it as your parish. Your children are your flock, and you are their pastor. Now consider how a parish would fare, if only instructed and exhorted by classes and congregations, by catechizing and preaching. Is it not necessary to have private personal

intercourse between priest and people? Is it not necessary alone and expressly to thrust home particular warnings, to reprove particular acts, to encourage signs of improvement, to give private advice on private portions of conduct and religion? And, on reflection, is there any reason why all this is good, nay, is necessary, for the man, and yet useless for the boy? Rely upon it, you would find it of the greatest service to your scholars to regard them and teach them upon this principle. If after every severe punishment you would privately speak to the child punished, and try to make the chastisement reach its heart, then watch the effect, and from time to time afterwards sustain that effect: if you would privately ascertain what prayers each uses, how regularly, in what position, and the like: if you would take the upper classes systematically and speak to them singly for a few minutes, by two or three a day, so as to have such private intercourse with each once in two months, more or less, as you find advisable, you would do more towards sanctifying the character of your scholars than you could believe before trial. It is true you must be on your guard not to draw too much upon a child's conscience. You must not lead your little ones to say much to you; nor make them unreal; nor break down their shame and delicacy. Judgment and feeling are wanted, great judgment and sensitive feeling, but not more of either than a master ought to have.

"Again, it may seem that you would thus trench upon the work of the clergyman. There is not, however, the least difficulty upon this point. If he has time for the task and wishes to take it, your responsibility ends: but if he finds that the personal care of the parents of the children is even more than he is sufficient for, then the road is open to you.

"But his advice, and in special cases his interposition and private remonstrance and encouragement will always be at hand to fall back upon; a reserve so much the more influential from its reservedness: and there will often be cases in which you should thankfully surrender this charge to your spiritual superior and head."

This is the sort of intercourse between master and scholar, which it must be our grand endeavour to promote, by seeking for such qualifications in our schoolmasters as cannot be imparted by any mere intellectual training, whether it be secular or theological in its character. In this, as in all other offices connected with Christian education, the first of all requisites is a religious character.

ART. IV.—*Essays on subjects connected with the Reformation in England. Reprinted, with additions, from the "British Magazine." By the Rev.* S. R. MAITLAND, *D.D., F.S.A. Sometime Librarian to the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and Keeper of the MSS. at Lambeth.* London: Rivingtons.

THE contributions of the learned and able author of the volume before us to the literature of the age have been rather numerous, and they are in all cases distinguished by a research, an acuteness, and a boldness also, which place them far above the ordinary level. The natural and acquired powers which they display render their author a very formidable antagonist in literary warfare; and indeed it would seem that Dr. Maitland is conscious of his powers in this field of exertion, for we do not remember one amongst his numerous publications which is not controversial in its origin and its tone. His works on prophetical subjects are all subversive of existing systems of interpretation. He has laboured with great ability to shake the theory on which the chronological views of the majority of English writers on this subject have been founded. He has laboured, at great length, to demonstrate the mistake of those Protestant interpreters who hold up the Albigenses and the Waldenses as the two Witnesses in the Revelation, or who have thought that the succession of Christianity was preserved amongst them only, in the middle ages—nothing can be more able, and in parts more intensely comic, than these productions. And again, the unwearied assiduity which this learned writer has expended in tracking and tracing out the blunders or errors of editors of works bearing on the Reformation; his elaborate arguments to prove that Fox the Martyrologist is altogether untrustworthy; his able work on the "Dark Ages" in which he proves the injustice of those who assert that there was no such thing as Christian knowledge, learning, education, or goodness of any kind from the ninth century to the Reformation; and in which he further shows the great value of monastic institutions in those ages, and meets the vulgar calumnies and prejudices against them;—all this is essentially controversial and critical in its character—it is the produce of a mind which is controversial in its nature, and which has acquired a bent wholly in *one direction.*

The author of the volume before us has spent his literary life

for a long series of years in exposing the errors, and refuting the assertions, of certain classes of persons who are warmly opposed to Romanism, and who have, without doubt, in some instances, misstated or overstated facts. And, certainly, as far as the mere question of fact is concerned, every one who is competent to do so is quite right in endeavouring to correct mistakes. But we must own our apprehension, that when men like the author of this volume expend their powers in the endeavour to subvert the system in which large classes have been accustomed to repose their religious convictions, without, at the same time, supplying any positive system in its place, the result of such a course of proceeding may, in times of religious excitement, tend to the promotion of opinions which the author himself would most certainly deprecate.

A continued attack upon the foundation of men's opinions is calculated either to irritate their feelings, or else to shake their convictions. We are disposed to agree with Dr. Maitland in many points; but still we are of opinion that, whatever may be the abstract truth of certain positions of his, it does not follow that it is expedient to put forward exclusively that class of facts. When a writer is engaged in producing facts which tend to throw discredit on the Reformation, we think it might not be too much to expect from him something to counterbalance this on the other side. This in fact was what we had very much to complain of in the late Romanizing party. They could never speak except in praise of the Church of Rome; its errors were to be softened down; its merits were to be carefully dwelt on; and, on the other hand, every fault and defect in the English Church was to be studiously pointed out. The result of course was, that not only the individuals, who were thus over-liberal, in time came to be persuaded by their own statements; that they ought to join the Roman Church, but all the world had long before seen that such must be the result.

Dr. Maitland is an earnest admirer of truth, but we think he is rather too ready to impute intentional falsehood to those from whom he differs. The work before us opens with a charge of falsehood against the writers on whom the history of the Reformation, as opposed to the Romish view of that history, very much depends:—

"For the history of the Reformation in England," he says, "we depend so much on the testimony of writers, who may be considered as belonging, or more or less attached, to the Puritan party,—or who obtained their information from persons of that sect,—that it is of the utmost importance to inquire whether there was any thing in their

notions respecting *truth*, which ought to throw suspicion on any of their statements."—p. 1.

Now this obviously applies to such leading writers as Fox and Strype, the latter of whom is severely criticized in the work before us. What is the tendency of such statements and inuendos as this? It is plainly to throw discredit on all writers on our side of the question, and thus to prepare the mind for receiving from Dr. Lingard, or Miss Strickland, or some other writer of that class, those prejudices against the Reformation and its chief agents, which is just what Romanism is anxious to establish. We proceed with Dr. Maitland's statements:—

"The question is one which does not require much research or argument. There is something very frank (one is almost inclined to say, honest) in the avowals, either direct or indirect, which various puritans have left on record, that it was considered not only allowable, but meritorious *to tell lies* for the sake of the good cause in which they were engaged, and for the benefit of those who were fellow helpers in it."—Ibid.

Dr. Maitland informs us that his object in bringing forward facts to substantiate this assertion is, "not to criminate any person or class of persons, but to inquire how far we may rely on statements resting on the authority of those who adopted puritan principles." Whatever may be the "object," we cannot doubt that the *effect* must be what Dr. Maitland describes. The "person" or "class of persons" referred to cannot, we think, come out of the matter very much improved, by being convicted of holding the principle that it is "*meritorious* to tell lies."

But we must consider the grounds on which such a charge was made against men who, whatever may have been their defects in some points, had the courage to oppose prevalent superstitions at a time when *death* was the frequent consequence of so doing. It should not be too readily assumed that persons who acted thus were systematic liars. We will take the first case mentioned by Dr. Maitland in proof of his position,—the case of George Joye, a fellow of Peter House, Cambridge, a friend of Bilney, and who was connected with the publication of Tyndale's translation of the New Testament. It appears that Joye was charged with heresy in 1527 by John Ashwell, Prior of Newnham Abbey, near Bedford, who secretly applied to the Bishop of Lincoln to punish him.

A little work of Joye is still extant in which, as Dr. Maitland informs us, he confutes the charges of the Prior point by point; but this work is quoted with the object of "inquiring how far he was a *credible witness* as *to matters of fact*;" and from the quotation made by Dr. Maitland we learn that there were letters

sent "as from the cardinal," delivered to the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, commanding him to send up Joye to appear before the cardinal legate for certain erroneous opinions. Joye obeyed the citation, and describes very graphically his attendance at the cardinal's palace, and his standing and waiting in the hall where many bishops passed by, whose "solemn and lordly" looks made him think that he saw nothing "but the galouse and the hangman;" but none of whom, "as grace was," knew him. Then we have an account of a similar attendance on the Bishop of Lincoln, and his chancellor, and the fears which Joye entertained; and, at the close of the interview between the chancellor and Joye, the secretary inquired where the latter was lodging in London, when Joye, apprehensive of the use they might make of the information, had he told them of his real residence, *gave them a wrong address.* "Here," he says, "I was so bold as to make the scribe a lye for his asking, telling him that I lay at the Green Dragon towards Bishopsgate, when I lay a mile off, even a contrary way; for *I never trusted scribes nor pharisees*, and I perceived he asked me not for any good."

On these words, which occur in the midst of an extract four pages long, Dr. Maitland (who marks them with italics which we have preserved) makes the following remarks:—

> "The reader will bear in mind that we are not discussing the question, whether George Joye had a right to deceive his persecutors; or, indeed, how far what he did was morally right or wrong. That is, no doubt, a very important question; but it is not the one now under consideration. We are at present only inquiring how far *he, or any member of the sect of which he was a leader*, may be relied on as an authority in matters relating to that sect. He tells us, without any appearance of hesitation or compunction, that he said what was false to others. May he not be doing the same to us? May we, for instance, believe that the prior's letter is genuine?"—p. 11.

Now we must frankly say, that in our opinion this case does not bear out Dr. Maitland's statements and inferences. The false address which Joye gave to his persecutors was with a view to his own personal safety. He was evidently afraid that, if he were to tell his residence, he might be seized and committed to prison, or otherwise injured; and we have no doubt that a misdirection given under such circumstances would at that period have been regarded by all parties alike, whether Romanist or Protestant, as a venial sin—a fault which did not require any great compunction of heart. Without doubt, as Dr. Maitland himself admits, it is a question—an important question—and we may add, a difficult question—how far such conduct as that of

George Joye was morally right or wrong. But, whatever judgment may be formed on this point, it is clear that *he* did not consider the trivial falsehood he had told, in giving a wrong address, as any grave sin; and, as we have said, we have no doubt that the same opinion was universal amongst all parties. It must be remembered that the falsehood was told simply and solely for the purpose of saving his life—and we think it would be most unreasonable to infer, from such a circumstance, that Joye was to be considered as a liar, and that he was likely to forge letters, or to tell falsehoods for the credit of his "sect," as Dr. Maitland disdainfully designates the party favourable to reformation. If Dr. Maitland himself were placed in similar circumstances, we would not answer for his acting differently from Joye, and we think it very possible that he might not afterward regard his offence as of a very deep die. Joye misdirected his persecutors; but we have no reason to believe that, if he had been actually brought to the test, he would have denied the doctrines which he held, or would have told any falsehood for the credit of his sect.

The next case produced by Dr. Maitland to prove that Puritans, as he calls them, are not to be trusted in any statements affecting their "sect," is that of Antony Dalaber, a scholar of St. Alban's Hall, and resident in the University of Oxford. It seems that this youth was an intimate friend of Thomas Garrett, Curate of Honey Lane, London, who was afterwards burned for his religious opinions. Garrett having been seized at Oxford by the emissaries of Cardinal Wolsey and the Bishop of London, and afterwards escaping for his life by aid of his friend Dalaber, the latter in his turn was seized and brought before the commissary, where he was interrogated as to his knowledge of Garrett's retreat; and he, with a view to save the life of his friend, from whom he had received the opinions which he had embraced, mentioned some circumstances which were not true, in order to put the persecutors on a wrong scent, and thus to save their victim; and, being then sworn on "the mass-book," he repeated the same statement.

Dr. Maitland says, that these stories do "not seem to require much comment;" we think, however, that they require some, and shall endeavour to supply it.

It seems to us, then, most unfair to argue from such a case as this to the untrustworthiness of Puritans as historians. What on earth has such a case as this to do with their honesty as narrators? In the present case, a young man invents a story to *save the life* of a friend. This is obviously an instance of the same kind as the last referred to; probably no one at that time would have thought such an action very sinful. The swearing on the

mass-book does not seem to us to make quite as great a difference between this case and that of Joye as might at first sight appear; for, without doubt, Dalaber looked in the mass-book with very little reverence.

However this may be, we think it scarcely reasonable to infer, as Dr. Maitland does, from such facts, that the Puritans were ready to tell lies on all occasions—that, because they would sometimes give false addresses to save their own or their friends' lives, they would voluntarily and consciously falsify the facts of history. We come to the next case adduced to prove that Puritans were all liars. It is the case of an apprentice named Thomas Green, accused of circulating some book displeasing to the powers in Church and State. Confined as he was in the Bishop of London's prison, and examined by the bishop's commissary or vicar-general, it seems that his alleged offence was against the laws of the Church rather than those of the State. In his examination he told a falsehood in order to shelter himself and the person from whom he had received the book in question; and Dr. Maitland from hence infers, that as Fox the Martyrologist speaks of the "simplicity" of Green, and says that he suffered for the truth, we must conclude that Fox and the Puritans approved of the practice of telling falsehoods for the benefit of religion. To us it seems that Fox did not mean to express any opinion in favour of Green's conduct. The very term "simplicity" does not necessarily imply any approbation; it is, in our view, rather depreciatory than otherwise in its meaning; and there can be no doubt that what Green suffered was for "the truth," though he himself showed a want of strictness in telling the truth when his life was endangered. We can only say, that if the honesty of all persons favourable to the Reformation is to be denied on account of such instances as this, it appears to be on insufficient grounds.

Another case is referred to by Dr. Maitland as furnishing convincing evidence in behalf of his position. Careless, a weaver of Coventry, in his examination before Dr. Martin, who had a commission to interrogate him on certain religious matters, stated that there was no contention between himself and certain other persons with whom he had been disputing in the King's Bench prison, and denied that he knew one of them. And yet, notwithstanding this, Fox published the letters of Careless; and Coverdale republished them, and Bickersteth has recently done the same. The inference is, that Puritans are not to be trusted—that they are liars. Now let us consider the facts. It appears from Dr. Maitland's own pages that the examination of Careless, in which these falsehoods are stated, is not comprised in the only edition of Fox's "Martyrology," to which he could refer, and that

he is of opinion himself that Fox printed the examination in the first edition of the "Martyrology," but *omitted* it in subsequent ones. We really think that this fact goes far to prove, in opposition to Dr. Maitland's assertion, that Fox and the Puritans *had* some regard to truth, and did feel that falsehood was wrong; and it is also a fact, that Careless himself confesses his fault in such terms as cannot be interpreted into any approbation of his own conduct. When a man speaks of himself as having "lied falsely," we think that he can hardly be supposed to have *justified* his act. Dr. Maitland does not attempt to *prove* that Careless or Fox thought the falsehoods told by Reformers were right and justifiable; and yet he infers that such was their opinion; and, further, that they thought it lawful to deceive and lie on all occasions when the cause of their religion could be promoted by it.

Such is the whole amount of the evidence which Dr. Maitland adduces to establish his position, that the history of the Reformation is, for the greater part, undeserving of credit, as being supported by Puritan evidence. Such are the proofs which he adduces of the alleged principle of Puritanism that it is right to tell lies for the sake of the good cause, and of course to falsify history. We think that such charges ought to rest on some stronger evidence than on the sayings of a few persons, at a time when they were in personal danger, and when they were led to make some questionable or false statements in order to save their lives or those of their friends. We think that these individuals themselves ought not to be harshly censured for such actions, or to be assumed to be habitual liars, or to hold any such *principle* as Dr. Maitland ascribes to them; and still less can any such principle be ascribed to any *class* of men amongst the supporters of the Reformation.

Dr. Maitland having endeavoured to prove that all the facts narrated by Fox, Strype, and such writers, are uncertain, and cannot be depended upon, he proceeds to remove, as far as possible, the prejudice against Queen Mary, Bonner, and Gardiner, by throwing blame on the persecuted Protestants.

"What kindled and fanned the fires of Smithfield? What raised and kept alive the popish persecution in the days of Queen Mary? Was it her own sanguinary disposition? Or was she the slave of her husband's cruel superstition? Or were both the tools of foreigners, who certainly hated the English because they were heretics, but more deadly hated the heretics because they were Englishmen? Was it 'wily Winchester,' or was it 'bloody Bonner,' or was it something in the spirit of the Church of which both were zealous members? Whatever may be said on any or on all of these points, there was undoubtedly one other cause; which, if it be too much to say that it has been studiously concealed or dis-

guised, has certainly never occupied that prominent place to which it is entitled in such an inquiry. I mean the bitter and provoking spirit of some of those who were very active and forward in promoting the cause of the Reformation—the political opinions which they held, and the language in which they disseminated them—the fierce personal attacks which they made on those whom they considered as enemies—and, to say the least, the little care which was taken by those who were really actuated by religious motives, and seeking a true Reformation of the Church, to shake off a lewd, ungodly, profane rabble, who joined the cause of Protestantism . . . . In particular it seems impossible that any reflecting mind . . . . should fail to see, as a mere matter of fact, in how great a degree the persecution of the Protestants of England was caused by the conduct of their brethren who were in exile."—pp. 41, 42.

In this passage, and what follows, Dr. Maitland assumes the character of an apologist for the proceedings of Queen Mary, and Bonner, and Gardiner, against the Reformers. We have no doubt that he does not wish to be regarded in this light, and yet, positively and unquestionably, such *is* the position in which he has placed himself. Observe what he has said in the above passage. He first inquires to what cause we are to assign the cruelties and persecutions in the time of Mary. He inquires whether it had any thing to do with the causes usually assigned (which were the *true* causes). Dr. Maitland does not pronounce any opinion on this subject. He leaves the reader at liberty to believe that it is quite a matter of question whether the "sanguinary disposition of Mary," her husband's "cruel superstition," the hatred of "foreigners," "wily Winchester," or even "bloody Bonner," or the spirit of the Church of Rome, were really the causes of the burning of Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, and of so many hundreds of pious and faithful men. Dr. Maitland leaves the reader in doubt as to what his own opinion is on this point; the only certain fact which he puts before him is—that the party of the Reformation *brought down punishment upon itself* by its own bitterness, provocations, dangerous political opinions and language, fierce personal attacks, and association with a lewd, ungodly, and profane rabble! If such a line of argument be justifiable, it amounts, of course, to a justification, to a very great extent, of the persecutions under Mary. They will be viewed as harsh, but still *excusable* measures (considering the habits and feelings of that age), and as undertaken simply in *self-defence*. We know not what point of view this can be regarded in, except as an apology for Queen Mary and the Romish cause. Granted that there were (as there must necessarily have been) many acts of enthusiasm, of insubordination; acts of various kinds, more or less faulty, amongst the adherents of the Reformation; would it not be unreasonable and

cruel to infer that these acts of isolated and enthusiastic individuals—persons also generally of the lower classes of society, and very imperfectly educated, and who were also smarting under a bloody tyranny and persecution—that such isolated acts, caused in a great degree by the barbarities exercised against the people, should be held up as affording a true account of the causes of the persecutions of the English martyrs? In these days we may have, perhaps, to apologise for the use of the term "martyrs." We ought, perhaps, to have spoken of them as "malefactors," or "rebels," or "sectarians." But we have not yet advanced so far with the liberal religionism of the day as to look on Mary as a gentle, pious, and injured woman; or on Elizabeth as a monster of cruelty, lust, and intolerance; or on Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Jewell as heretics and bigots. We still retain the opinion that Mary was a cruel persecutor, and that she and her advisers and helpers have to answer for the blood of many martyrs.

Without doubt, Dr. Maitland may not have intended to involve in one common condemnation all the adherents of the Reformation. Indeed, he intimates, in the above passage, that some there were who "were really actuated by religious motives, and seeking a true Reformation of the Church;" but we submit, that such an incidental admission as this is not in any degree calculated to counterbalance the prejudice raised by him against the persecuted party generally, by ascribing that persecution to their own misconduct; and we must be excused for adding, that when Dr. Maitland states, as he does at the commencement of the above passage, that the conduct to which he refers as blamable has been "studiously concealed or disguised," and that it has not occupied the "prominent place" which it ought; it might have occurred to him, that those who were really attached to the cause of the Reformation could scarcely have been expected to parade the faults of its adherents, or to give them the "prominence" which he thinks advisable.

We now come to the examples which Dr. Maitland has quoted, to show the provocations offered by the Reformers to the Popish party. He has, without doubt, selected the writer who has the worst reputation of any, amongst the writers on that side of the question—we allude to Bale—and he has produced, from his answer to Bonner's Visitation Articles, many very offensive passages. Nevertheless, offensive as these passages were, from their personal abuse of Bonner, it cannot, we think, be alleged, with any propriety, that they were the cause of the persecution of the "Puritans," as Dr. Maitland calls all these adherents of the Reformation. On referring to Fox and to Burnet, we learn that the Visitation of Bonner began on the 8th of September, 1554;

and Dr. Maitland himself (p. 50) states, that it is reasonable to suppose that "Bale's 'Declaration' was put in circulation either then, (about the 5th *October*,) or very soon after."

Now, then, what was the state of the case at this time? Could this tract of Bale's, abusive as it was, have been the *cause* of what had passed in the year 1553, and the spring and summer of 1554, when all the bishops and clergy attached to the Reformation had been expelled from their benefices, multitudes of them brought before the council, and committed to prison as heretics—when Cranmer had been attainted, and he, with Ridley and Latimer, had been condemned as heretics at Oxford, and were in prison there—when Bradford and many other pious and faithful men were in the Tower in London, and every one was awaiting the torture of the martyrs? Assuredly, Dr. Maitland is sadly at fault in his chronology here. Bale's abusive tone *may* have been personally offensive to Bonner; but we should be more inclined to think, that to such a spirit as Bonner's the abuse of Bale would have been rather a matter of triumph than of irritation, considering their respective positions. And we must say this also, that, bad as Bale's language was, it was only paying Bonner in his own coin; for a more foul-mouthed and brutally ferocious persecutor than Bonner never existed. His articles may not have been abusive, as Dr. Maitland tells us; but will he contend, that Bonner himself, in such records of his sayings and doings as have come down to us, appears otherwise than as a savage? Yes! he *does* contend that Bonner was a very worthy and amiable man: we shall see hereafter what his views are on this subject.

The next extract is from the writings of Poynet, the deprived Bishop of Winchester, (pp. 71—75,) in which he speaks in strong and abusive language of Bonner and Gardiner, and refers to various passages of their past history, including their tergiversations in the time of Henry VIII., and the alleged bastardy of Bonner; the latter point being brought forward as showing the inconsistency of Bonner in exacting conformity to the Roman Canon Law, while he himself was ordained irregularly and in opposition to its rules. We have no further comment to make on this than that which has been made in the case of Bale.

And now to turn to the third instance which Dr. Maitland has brought forward—the case of Traherne. Now, how Dr. Maitland, with his characteristic acuteness, can have produced the extracts which he has done, from a work of Traherne printed in 1558, in order to prove that the "Puritans" brought down on themselves the persecution which raged from 1553 to 1558, and *then ended*, is certainly an enigma to us. Queen Mary died in

November, 1558, after a reign of five years. It seems a strange oversight to adduce the language of a work, published some time in the course of that very year, as amongst the causes which led to the persecutions of the Protestants!

Dr. Maitland next produces a number of extracts, from works written beyond seas by the English and Scotch exiles, to prove that their language was seditious, and that the government of Queen Mary was obliged to repress a party which could thus write. But he makes a statement, at the beginning of his series of extracts, which very much diminishes their value; for he acknowledges that he cannot arrange them chronologically, in consequence of the uncertainty of their *dates*. Now, in this question, the date is of the highest importance, for the cause must be prior in order of time to the effect; and, if the persecutions in England were caused by the seditious language of the exiles, there ought to be some proof that the latter *preceded* the former; which, however, Dr. Maitland fails to produce. He observes, in reference to the arrangement of his extracts from seditious writings:—

"Two modes of arrangement immediately present themselves. First, the order of time; and this I should be very glad to follow; but in dealing with books of this kind and period it is not easy, if possible, to do it. For, in the first place, some have no dates, and offer no precise internal evidence. Secondly, some may be very reasonably suspected of wrong dates, as it is beyond all question that they bear the names of wrong places. Thirdly, in dealing with works intended for clandestine circulation among a particular sect or community, we must calculate on the probability of their having been passed from hand to hand, and circulated for a considerable time in manuscript before they were printed at all. Fourthly, (and I would take the liberty of throwing it out as a hint to the editors of books belonging to this period,) we must be cautious how we judge of the date of a fact, or the date of a book, because the fact is recorded in the book. The volume, without bearing any mark of it, may be a reprint, with alterations or interpolations, which may lead to mistakes in opinions respecting dates formed upon them."—pp. 98, 99.

The result of all this is, that Dr. Maitland presents us with a large mass of extracts from works published against Queen Mary and her party, but without any attempt to assign any date to them, which is obviously a fatal flaw in his argument; for he was bound to show that these writings *preceded* Mary's persecutions, if those persecutions were the effect of such seditious publications. We must be permitted also to observe, that in the judgment of many persons Mary was really an illegitimate child, and no true heir of the throne, being the issue of Henry's

marriage with his brother's wife, and having been declared illegitimate and excluded from the succession by the Parliament in the reign of King Henry VIII., and also by her brother, Edward VI. She was, in the eyes of very many persons, an usurper, as well as a bloody persecutor; and it is rather too much to assume, as Dr. Maitland appears to do, the unquestionable nature of her title to the throne. Without doubt many of these writings assailed Mary with violence, and sought her dethronement; but Dr. Maitland should at least have given us the date of these writings, when he "asks the reader to consider what the Queen and the Government of England must have thought of those persons abroad who sent over, and those in this country who circulated, such books as he has quoted from, and how they must have felt disposed, nay, compelled, to treat them?" (p. 148.) There is another remark, which we are tempted to make on all these alleged proofs,—Dr. Maitland expends more than 100 pages in quoting from certain writings; but *whose* writings are they? They are, as he tells us, the writings of the "English exiles," *i. e.* of men who had been compelled to escape for their lives from the realm of England! Does not this look somewhat as if the persecution had preceded the writings, instead of the writings the persecution? Dr. Maitland may depend upon it that Knox, Goodman, &c. had not merely gone on a summer tour to enjoy themselves at Geneva or Frankfort. They went there to save their lives, after having lost all their earthly possessions; nor could they have obtained refuge in France, or in the Low Countries, where persecution was raging only in an inferior degree to England. If they did write angrily and violently against the Queen of England, they did not write without having already experienced persecution; and yet Dr. Maitland would persuade us that the severities exercised against the Reformers were *caused* by these writings! The truth is, that the extracts themselves throughout speak of the cruelties, the burnings, the murders practised by Queen Mary and her party on the Protestants of England, and were in no case, as far as we can see, written prior to the Marian persecutions.

Dr. Maitland quotes at great length various extracts from the writings of Knox, Goodman, and Bale during their exile, in which they deny the title of Queen Mary to the throne, and even go so far as to contend that the sovereignty of females is contrary to the word of God. Knox's book on this subject is well known. He has not, as far as we see, attempted any further proof that the English exiles held the tenets of Knox on this point, or that his book was approved and circulated in England. However, he *assumes* that the whole "Puritan" or "Protestant" party was

committed to this doctrine; and then he proceeds to narrate with infinite satisfaction, and with every possible detail, their alleged change of doctrine on this point at the accession of Queen Elizabeth, which he ascribes to the most degrading personal objects. He endeavours to prove these exiles to be a set of designing knaves. We must make a few extracts in illustration of the manner in which this subject is treated.

"I have shown," he says, "the grounds on which these leading men of the party denounced it as 'monstruous,'—[we must correct an inaccuracy here; this term is that of Knox, and not that of all the others,]—and I am not aware that as long as Queen Mary lived any one of them, or of their party, published one word of reply or repudiation. It is obvious, therefore, that when they came to see the Lady Elizabeth actually stepping into the throne they must have felt themselves in an awkward predicament.

"To refer to no other points which had been discussed, she was a woman as well as her sister, and no one who has read the foregoing pages can doubt that she would consider many of the passages which I have quoted as capable of a very clear and unpleasant application to herself. Of course, if Mary was a thing accursed because she was a woman, so was Elizabeth; and, if the 'regiment" of one of these creatures was 'monstruous,' so would be that of the other. It must have puzzled the party extremely, and *we cannot doubt* that it was the subject of much thought and consultation; and, judging from the result, *we may suppose* that they who were most concerned in the matter came to a decision that, as what had been done could not be undone, and what had been said could not be unsaid, it would be best to put a good face on the matter; to throw John Knox, the most violent and notorious maintainer of the opinion overboard, at once and for ever; to say as little as possible about the way in which the subject had been treated by Goodman and others, of whom it could not be pretended that they were 'Scots,' and 'straungers;' and to say as much as could be said in the way of denial, explanation, apology, contradiction. &c., by the pen of some stanch member of the party who was not particularly and personally committed in the subject of female government. Happily for their need, they had among them a man 'sharp in his discourse, facetious, bold, free of speech, blunt in words, stout and courageous;' and it does credit to their sagacity or his, that he was immediately in the field as the champion of the party."—pp. 196, 197.

The meaning of this passage is obvious. It ascribes the most gross and barefaced knavery and lying to the whole body of the English exiles, amongst whom, be it remembered, were such men as Jewell.

Let us see, then, the evidence on which Dr. Maitland makes this serious charge. The person referred to in the above extract as the "champion of the party" in their difficulty was Aylmer,

afterwards Bishop of London. Dr. Maitland states that the real reason why Strype published the "Life and Times" of Aylmer is "not once hinted at throughout the preface,"—a great act of dishonesty we suppose,—and that it was because a descendant of Bishop Aylmer's was a bookseller, and urged Strype to publish his life, supplying him at the same time with materials and papers. And now to the proofs of Dr. Maitland's charge.

He quotes from Strype a passage in which it is stated that Aylmer, before his return from exile to England, printed at Strasburg a work in answer to Knox's book, "which he wrote upon a consultation, as it seems, holden among the exiles, the better to obtain the favour of the new queen, and to take off any jealousy she might conceive of them and the religion they professed."—p. 203.

We must here take the liberty to say, that neither Strype nor Dr. Maitland himself states it as a positive matter of fact that any such consultation took place. Dr. Maitland says, "We cannot doubt" that there was much thought and consultation on the subject, and that "we may suppose" that the persons concerned, resolved to adopt a certain course of proceeding, and chose Aylmer as their instrument. But may we be permitted to suggest to Dr. Maitland, that before he imputes such gross knavery to a set of men who had suffered in the cause of religion, he ought to have some more certain ground to go on than his "suppositions" or his strong conjectures. Men are not to be set down as liars and knaves because they may be "supposed" to have acted as liars and knaves do. We require *facts* to substantiate charges of this kind; and Dr. Maitland has not supplied us with facts, but with theories and probabilities, which may be altogether mistaken.

We deeply regret to be obliged thus to point out the very insufficient evidence on which Dr. Maitland deals condemnation on large classes of men connected with the cause of the English Reformation. But we deem it merely an act of ordinary justice and charity to relieve their memories, as far as we can, from insufficiently sustained charges.

In Dr. Maitland's opinion Aylmer's attempt to answer Knox's book exhibited "a degree of assurance which has perhaps never been equalled." Why so? There is not a shadow of ground for asserting that Aylmer was not perfectly sincere and honest in his publication; or for maintaining, that the doctrines held by Knox were those of the great body of the English exiles, or that Aylmer believed them to be so, while he asserted the contrary. Aylmer's book itself, according to the extracts made from it by Dr. Maitland, states, that he had met with Knox's work a year before, and

that he would have answered it sooner, only that he understood it was about to be answered by a more competent person; but, finding at length that it had not been answered, he undertook to do so himself; and he disclaims for himself and for all his friends any further participation in Knox's views than consisted in mere silence, adding, that all "the best learned" concur with him in his doctrine in opposition to Knox. Dr. Maitland has no other mode of proving that Aylmer here spoke falsely, and intended to do so, than by asserting that "it is quite clear that Aylmer, while he did not mean to 'defame the man,' meant to remove the 'inconvenience' as much as possible from his own party, by repudiating the 'stranger' and his performances." We must be allowed to deny that, in our opinion, any thing of the kind is "quite clear," and we do not think it right thus to fix dishonest motives on a man without proof of any kind.

We must make the same remark on what Dr. Maitland says of Aylmer's description of the qualifications of preachers, which, he insinuates, was for the purpose of pointing out to the queen that she must have a body of Christian ministers in her kingdom, and that as, "of course, such pulpit men could not be had without considerable expense, it was necessary to show her majesty not only that there were very fit persons, who were willing and desirous to stir up the nation to provide her freely and amply with the means of paying all her servants (bishops among the rest, if she chose to have any), but also that these very fit men would take the office on very moderate terms." (p. 217.) Because Aylmer points out the qualifications of preachers in these times, Dr. Maitland infers at once that he meant to direct the queen's notice to the Puritans; and, because he recommends the bishops to give up their superfluities, he infers that the object was to induce the queen to select Puritan bishops. This is simply Dr. Maitland's argument, which we think most objectionable in every point of view. He subsequently describes Aylmer as a suitor for preferment on the strength of his book, apparently without the slightest reason (as assigned by him) except the assumed motive of its publication.

> "It seems that for four years, all but eleven days—what an age to a keen suitor—she sat upon her throne, and slept in her bed, unmindful of her eulogist; or, to say the least, before he received any reward for his panegyric."—p. 223.

We now pass on to another branch of the subject, "The Ribalds," as Dr. Maitland designates those who assailed the prevalent superstitions by raillery and ridicule. The imputation is made to apply to all the Reformers in a greater or less degree—

even Cranmer is brought in, as connected with it and countenancing it. Dr. Maitland thus commences:—

"We were considering the mode in which the Puritan party adopted in meeting the change of religion which then took place; and it has been shown that much plainness of speech was used by them in opposing the false doctrines and superstitious practice of the Church of Rome. They concluded that the pope was Antichrist—that his faith was false, his practice idolatrous, his mass devilish, and every thing about him, or in any sort of communion with him, utterly abominable in the sight of that God whom he blasphemed by pretended worship. If they were right, the matter was surely very sad as well as serious. One would think, that if such men came to know that Chemosh and Ashtaroth had been set up in the Lord's house, they would have entered its courts in sackcloth, and the spirit of heaviness, to displace them.

"But the matter was far otherwise. If there were men who acted under such feelings, in grave, and quiet, and grateful piety; if there were others who mistook passion for zeal, and sincerely believed themselves authorized, nay, called upon, to do and say all that prophets or apostles had ever said or done . . .;—if there were, as we may believe, some of all these classes, there were at the same time other partisans of the Reformation, very noisy and *very numerous*, of quite a different spirit, whom, *to say the least*, they did not keep at a proper distance, or repudiate with sufficiently marked detestation. I mean those who used a jeering, scoffing humour, to turn the ministers and the services of religion into ridicule; men who employed themselves in raising a laugh against popery, at whatever expense, and in providing for the eyes and ears of even the rude multitude, who could not read, gross and profane pictures, jests, songs, interludes—all, in short, that could nurse the self-conceit of folly, and agitate ignorance into rebellion against its spiritual pastors and teachers."—p. 226.

After this introduction, Dr. Maitland introduces on the stage Thomas Cromwell, King Henry's vicar-general, and (as might have been anticipated) paints him in the most revolting colours, as an infidel, a scoffer, a hypocrite, and a selfish and designing villain. Having alleged that Cromwell was the grand patron of the blasphemies and ribaldry which were then so rife, and that he even kept in his household a number of persons to manufacture tracts, songs, &c. of the most offensive nature, he winds up the whole affair by the following piece of information about Cranmer in a note, where, in allusion to a quotation produced by a correspondent to show that there were persons who disapproved of ribald writings, he adds,—

"I need hardly say, that it would require many more, and much stronger and weightier, to counterbalance the single pregnant voluminous sentence of Strype,—'Wherefore he consulting with the Lord Cromwell, his CONSTANT ASSOCIATE AND ASSISTANT [the capitals are

Dr. Maitland's] in SUCH matters, and by his and other his friends importuning the king, a commission was issued,' &c. *Cran.* i. 72. A little further on, Strype tells us, that the archbishop 'required direction from him [Cromwell] in every thing."'—pp. 79. 241.

Now this amounts to a distinct attack upon Cranmer himself, the leader of the Reformation, charging him with participation in the whole system of ribaldry of which Dr. Maitland complains. But we add with satisfaction, that Dr. Maitland has not produced the slightest evidence for this gross charge against Cranmer; for the passages from Strype, quoted above, simply state the fact of Cranmer's confidence in Cromwell, but *do not prove that Cranmer was aware of all that was secretly done by Cromwell*, and do not make the slightest allusion to the publication of ribald writings. And further, even by Dr. Maitland's own admission, the only passage on which Cromwell stands charged with the concoction of such publications was *expunged* by Fox from his "Acts and Monuments;" and we may just as reasonably infer, that it was so expunged because Fox *doubted its truth*, as assume with Dr. Maitland, that it was rejected because it was thought discreditable. We confess that we look on the imputation on Cromwell, of keeping persons in his house to write scurrilous songs, &c., against the Church service, &c., as most improbable, and as requiring some good evidence to attest it.

We pass on to the instances which Dr. Maitland adduces of what he calls ribaldry. He prefaces these by the explanation that he is not referring to the controversies and contentions which naturally rose at that period, and which, even among the learned, were too often carried on in language which would not now be used; neither does he refer to the outbreaks of fanaticism which naturally accompanied such a period of excitement. We have the history of William Gardiner, an Englishman, and agent of a mercantile house at Lisbon, who took the host and chalice from a priest at Lisbon, in presence of the whole court, and acted more like a madman than a rational being. Dr. Maitland's reason for selecting this history is "to help us to judge of the light in which the *English Reformers*, and their proceedings, were likely to be viewed in foreign countries," (p. 245)—as if the freaks of this shopboy were to be rightly held as representing the spirit and principles of Cranmer and the leaders of the English Reformation! Not satisfied with this, Dr. Maitland rakes together whatever stories of fanaticism he can gather from Strype and Fox; and then, having shown the light in which "the English Reformers" were "likely to be viewed," he

proceeds to his main business—to produce instances of "*ludicrous* things *every where* done in derision of the old forms and the images." And so he goes to work again, carefully extracting from Fox and Strype any instances which he can find of irreverence. One of the first extracts he produces is the following from Strype:—

"There were not a few, who, towards the declining of this year, did, more openly and commonly than before, speak of the holy sacrament with much contempt. Which, to speak the truth, the former idolatrous and superstitious doctrines thereof had given great occasion to; so that men condemned in their hearts and speech the whole thing, and reasoned unreverently of that high mystery, and in their sermons, or readings, or communication, called it by vile and unseemly terms. *They made rhymes, and plays, and jests of it.* And this occasioned chiefly the misuse of it: as it is expressed in the Act of Parliament of the first of Edward VI. cap. 1. Therefore was that act made, being the very first act of this king. And to back this act, especially when these contemptuous dealings with the sacrament continued still, and ceased not, the king sent forth a severe proclamation, December 27, against these irreverent talkers of the sacrament."—p. 251.

Now then, admitting that there were various ungodly persons—various persons also of a fanatical or an erroneous zeal—chiefly of the lower classes of society, who were guilty of irreverent language and actions to show their contempt of superstitions which, perhaps, they did not wholly understand—admitting all this, we say, Is not the passage here produced by Dr. Maitland himself, sufficient to exonerate the Reformers, and the Reformation generally, from the disgrace of countenancing such proceedings? Here we find Edward VI., in his very first act, repressing, in the severest manner, all such profane and disgusting exhibitions, and following it up by a royal proclamation; or, rather, we find *Cranmer* and the Protector Somerset, the leaders of the Reformed cause, thus acting. Did this look much like countenancing the ribaldry of which Dr. Maitland complains; and has he even been able to produce from Strype any approbation of the acts which Dr. M. quotes from his pages? He has not done so; and in fact, Fox and Strype, as far as we have observed in their works, simply state the facts, without expressing any opinion about them. We contend, therefore, that Dr. Maitland altogether fails to substantiate his charge against the English Reformers of, "at the least," not keeping such persons "at a proper distance;" or not "repudiating them with sufficiently marked detestation;" or, as in the case of Cranmer, of being directly mixed up with one who was the prime mover in all such acts of iniquity.

Dr. Maitland cannot, apparently, touch on a subject without finding out something to the disadvantage of the Reformers. Being led to speak of the Act of Six Articles made in the reign of Henry VIII., he remarks, in justification of this cruel and bloodthirsty legislation, that "the law was *principally* made to repress the filthiness and foolish talking of those who had no reverence for sacred things; who lived by railing and scoffing at them; and who had no principle which should prevent their abjuring or perjuring any thing that might come in their way" (p. 256). Now, when we remember that this Act decreed, that all who denied transubstantiation should be burnt as heretics; and that all who impugned the doctrine that communion in both kinds is needless—that priests may not marry—that vows of chastity should be observed—that solitary masses are right—or that auricular confession is necessary—should be held guilty of felony without benefit of clergy, we really do think that it argues some slight degree of over-confidence in Dr. Maitland to make such an assertion as we have just quoted. This Act was principally directed against scoffers. *Was* it so? Were Latimer and Shaxton, who were, in consequence, thrown into prison, and forced to resign their bishoprics, amongst these irreligious and "perjured" men? Were the 500 persons who were all presently in prison, filthy and foolish talkers, and men without principle?

Not satisfied with this attempt to justify the Act of the Six Articles as a righteously intended measure, Dr. Maitland goes on to argue, that Protestant controversialists and writers have wofully exaggerated the *numbers* of those who suffered under its penalties.

"Surely, a reader, who knows no more of the facts than what he may gather from these writers, would expect to find, as the story went on, that torrents of blood were shed, and the number of the slain incalculable. He might, indeed, consider the fact, that the 'cruel time' (not to say *any* enforcement of the Act) did not begin till more than a year after the 'bloody Six Articles' had passed, as indicating a strange degree of moderation or impotence, in those who had framed it in bloodthirsty vengeance; and this might lead him to expect exaggeration in the historians. But would he not think that he made all due allowance, if he dated the persecution from after the death of Cromwell, and, finding that thenceforth they 'suffered daily,' he assumed the charitable minimum of one sufferer per day for all England, and so limited his idea of the number of martyrs to somewhat more than five-and-twenty thousand? Would he not be startled, if any one told him that he would have to look sharp for five-and twenty, and might dismiss the thousands as being figures, not of arithmetic, but of speech? It may be a confession of ignorance; but I must say, that I have not found so many.

I have not indeed made such inquiry as would authorize my speaking positively and with precision. But precision is not wanted in such a matter."—p. 258.

Dr. Maitland certainly in this passage draws pretty largely on the principle laid down in the concluding sentence. He can lay no claim to "precision" at least. The death of Cromwell, which was followed by the persecution, took place at the end of July, 1540: from that date to the accession of Edward VI., at the end of January, 1547, is, according to *our* computation, exactly six years and a half; which comprise, in round numbers, 2370 days. Dr. Maitland, we suppose, will not pretend that the persecution under the Act of the Six Articles continued during the reign of Edward VI. The Act was, in fact, *repealed* in 1547. If Dr. Maitland's calculation of the number of sufferers under the Six Articles Act at 25,000, being at the rate of one *per diem*, be correct, we arrive at the somewhat curious and novel fact, that a hot persecution under the Six Articles Act raged against Protestantism during the whole reigns of Edward VI. and Elizabeth, as well as Mary, and that it even continued down to the year of grace 1610, the eighth year of King James I.! We congratulate Dr. Maitland on this interesting discovery. He has evidently "looked very sharp," to use his own words, into this part of ecclesiastical history; though we cannot, of course, compliment him on a "precision" which he modestly disclaims.

But really the very admissions made by Dr. Maitland appear fatal to his attempt. If, as he allows, "strict precision" is not to be so very urgently insisted on in matters of this kind, is he not himself most unreasonable in taking such an expression as "they suffered daily," after the death of Cromwell, to imply that the writer meant to assert simply and literally, that from the time of Cromwell's death till the end of Henry the Eighth's reign some one or other was regularly killed each day of the year, Sundays, holidays, and all included; that there was a kind of organized plan, that every single day a victim of this kind should smoke in atonement for the sins of the people? We must really demur to any such interpretation. The words plainly and in all common sense mean, that after a certain time, and during a certain time, (which is not defined,) executions for the cause of religion frequently,—sometimes, perhaps, daily,—took place. We think that it is very unreasonable to strain such expressions to their most literal sense, and then, after exaggerating the numerical result more than tenfold, to turn round upon us, and say, that instead of 25,000 martyrs there are probably not more than twenty-five; but that really the subject has not been investigated so as to enable a positive and precise statement to be made. It

may be, for aught we can see, that the author to whom Dr. Maitland refers did not *mean* that there were thousands of martyrs. As far as his mere *words*, "suffered daily," go, they do not amount to an assertion that any very great number suffered.

We must pass over various succeeding details of irreverent conduct and of improper language, which Dr. Maitland has diligently accumulated; but we may notice, in passing, the fact, that from his own extracts it appears that Protector Somerset disapproved of such doings, and disclaimed for himself and his party all association with them.—(pp. 298, 299.)

Having thus laboured assiduously, if not successfully, to throw discredit in every way on the moral character of so many of those who were engaged in the English Reformation, and to represent that their conduct was so blasphemous, wicked, and treasonable, that it was absolutely necessary to put them to death, or inflict penalties upon them, Dr. Maitland next proceeds to describe the Romish leaders Gardiner and Bonner, and their party, as worthy and well-meaning men.

He begins (p. 309) with Bishop Gardiner, (rather an unmanageable subject, we should have thought,) and starts with the suggestion that "the will of Henry VIII., under which Somerset and his colleagues took the reins of government, has been suspected of being *a forgery*." Dr. M. does not tell us *who* made this accusation; but, as he repeats it without comment, we may infer that he thinks it possibly may have been so; and thus, again, we have the party favourable to the Reformation indirectly charged with want of common moral principle. Dr. M. even urges that it is very extraordinary that Gardiner's name should not have appeared in the commission, because he was a great favourite with King Henry VIII. This leads to details of Gardiner's life and doings, amongst which Dr. Maitland enters on the part alleged to be taken by Gardiner in endeavouring to procure the death of Queen Katharine Parr, and he labours assiduously to show that the whole story is incredible, having in view to prove that Gardiner was always in great favour with King Henry; and we presume, therefore, that there can be no way of accounting for his name not appearing in the commission, except on the supposition of Protestant forgery.

We have next a very lengthened discussion, which we do not mean further to notice, intended to prove that Gardiner and Bonner were not inconsistent in their opinions on the Royal Supremacy. Dr. Maitland produces many arguments to throw doubts on the genuineness of the preface by Bonner to Gardiner's book, "De Vera Obedientiâ;" but, after suggesting that this preface is by a different hand, and making a great many diffi-

culties about the place where it professed to be printed, he comes at last to a quotation from Fox (p. 373) which establishes clearly the fact against which he has been contending, and thus renders superfluous all the preceding discussion. If Fox's narrative be true, there is no use in attempting to throw doubts on the genuineness of a preface which Bishop Bonner expressly acknowledged in open court. We do not think that there is any thing particularly objectionable in Dr. Maitland's remarks in favour of Gardiner; but whatever is said is to the credit of this persecutor, and is so far advantageous to the Romish and anti-Reformation cause.

The case of Bishop Bonner is more elaborately treated, and every possible pains is taken to represent him as a maligned and ill-used man. We extract the following passage as comprising the view which Dr. Maitland is anxious to impress upon his readers:—

"When the reader of Fox has become sufficiently familiar with the 'MARVELLOUS RAGE,' and 'GREAT FURY,' that embellish so many of his descriptions of prelatical proceedings, to treat them as Mr. Burchell would have done,—when he calmly inquires what these tales, so full of rage and fury, really mean—when they mean any thing—he finds the bloody wolf transformed, (I will not say into a spaniel, for that might imply fawning,) but into something much more like *a good-tempered mastiff*, who might safely be played with, and who, though he might be teazed into barking and growling, had no disposition to bite, and would not do it without orders. In plainer terms, setting aside *declamation*, and looking at the *details of facts* left by those who may be called, if people please, Bonner's victims, and their friends, we find, very consistently maintained, the character of a man, straightforward and hearty, familiar and humorous, sometimes rough, perhaps coarse, naturally hot-tempered, but obviously (by the testimony of his enemies) placable and easily entreated, capable of bearing most patiently much intemperate and insolent language, much reviling and low abuse directed against himself personally, against his order, and against those peculiar doctrines and practices of his Church, for maintaining which he had himself suffered the loss of all things, and borne long imprisonment. At the same time not incapable of being provoked into saying harsh and passionate things, but much more frequently meaning nothing, by the threatenings and slaughter which he breathed out, than to intimidate those on whose ignorance and simplicity arguments seemed thrown away—in short, we can scarcely read with attention any one of the cases detailed by those who are no friends of Bishop Bonner without seeing in him a judge who (even if we grant that he was dispensing bad laws badly) was obviously desirous to save the prisoner's life."—pp. 422, 423.

We congratulate Dr. Maitland on the subject of his eulogium; we can only express our wonder at the moral courage which

he has exhibited in attempting to whitewash the character of this ferocious persecutor: it is for the readers of Fox's "Martyrology" to form their opinion whether Dr. Maitland is right or wrong in his view.

We were certainly not prepared, from the author's reputation, to find his arguments so insufficiently sustained, and his imputations against moral character so sweeping and yet apparently so unfounded. The fact is, that his controversies with various writers on the Protestant side of the question have led him by degrees to take the Romish view, which sufficiently accounts for the excessive prejudice which he has against the Reformation and so many of its friends, without any necessary leaning to Romanism as a system of doctrine and practice.

Art. V.—1. *Cathedral Trusts and their Fulfilment. By the Rev.* Robert Whiston, *M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; and Head Master of the Cathedral Grammar School, Rochester. Second Edition.* London: Ollivier.

2. *Five Speeches on Ecclesiastical Affairs, delivered by* Edward Horsman, *Esq., M.P., in the House of Commons, in the Sessions of* 1847 *and* 1848. London: Seeleys.

3. *A Few Words on Cathedral Music and the Musical System of the Church. With a Plan of Reform. By* Samuel Sebastian Wesley, *Mus. Doc.* London: Rivingtons.

The question which has been opened in the publications at the beginning of this article, is one of great importance in all points of view; and requires careful consideration in all its bearings. It should be the aim of all churchmen, that in any arrangement which may be made in reference to cathedrals, the interests of the Church at large shall not suffer, but be advanced; and we have reason to feel grateful to writers like Mr. Whiston, who, at this particular crisis, have devoted themselves to the investigation of the origin and uses of cathedral institutions.

Mr. Whiston's name is, of course, known to all our readers in connexion with the suit which has lately been carried on between him and the chapter of Rochester, who deemed it fitting and right to deprive him of his office of Head Master of their school, in consequence of the publication of his pamphlet on Cathedral Trusts. Into the merits of the case, as between Mr. Whiston and the chapter of Rochester, we have no disposition to enter at present, more especially since the chapter have withdrawn their act of deprivation. But the pamphlet in question contains a very great amount of information on the subject of cathedral foundations, much of which is, we are persuaded, altogether new to the majority of the Church, and which on many accounts deserves to be attentively considered.

The origin of cathedral chapters traces itself up in some sort to the time of the apostles, when elders or presbyters, under the presidency of the bishop, were instituted in every city, and, with the deacons, constituted its cathedral clergy. This body was charged in common with the care of souls in the chief city of the primitive diocese or parish; and the bishop possessed the chief

office in this ministry, and authority over each of the clergy, though he determined on nothing of importance without previously consulting the clergy. Such was, in general, the system throughout the Church for more than a thousand years, when another system was gradually introduced. The presbyters of the cathedral church were intitled canons, and began to live together in a monastery attached to the cathedral, under certain collegiate rules. They were supported out of the common fund of the Church, which also supported deacons, and other inferior ministers. In after-ages, certain lands and possessions of the Church were appropriated to particular canonries, which then became benefices, though they still retained a share of the common property of the Church. Gradually, also, they were divested of the cure of souls, by the foundation of parish churches in the cathedral cities, and the appropriation of certain funds to their endowment. So that, at length, the cathedral presbyters were, as such, certainly sinecurists, though they retained various privileges, and were still nominally the bishop's council.

Such was, in general, the position of cathedral chapters at the era of the Reformation; and the system had worked so badly, that Archbishop Cranmer endeavoured to dissuade King Henry VIII. from founding chapters on the old model for the cathedrals of newly-founded sees, and of those sees of the older foundation in which monks had previously been installed. His objections were founded on the slothfulness and self-indulgent habits into which canons or prebendaries had fallen; and we can well understand this, in remembering that they were without cure of souls, and yet possessed ample pecuniary resources.

King Henry VIII. was the founder of no less than fourteen of the chapters now existing, eight of which were in place of the monastic bodies which had formerly been possessed of cathedrals. The remaining six were for sees newly founded by King Henry VIII. And it may here be remarked of this sovereign, that, amidst all his evil deeds, he certainly did more for the Church of England than any sovereign who has ever sat on the throne of England. None of his predecessors for 300 years founded a see. He alone founded six episcopal sees, and fourteen chapters. The recent erection of the see of Manchester, so reluctantly and grudgingly conceded, merely raises the number of sees to what Henry VIII. left it, while the *suffragan sees*, of which he erected *twenty-six*, have been allowed to fall into abeyance. With all our indignation at Henry's crimes, we have never yet been able to equal his good actions in this respect. The people, entrusted to the care of the bishops, have multiplied fourfold since the time of King Henry, but our episcopate has been *diminished* since his time.

It is very true that the funds which King Henry employed in the erection of sees and chapters had belonged to monasteries which he suppressed. This suppression may have been very wrong in some respects—we are not saying whether it was so or not; but we apprehend that in the present day, when monasteries are suppressed, their funds are wholly absorbed by the State. We have never heard of any Roman Catholic sovereign or ruler in modern times applying any part of the wealth he has gained from suppressing or robbing monasteries, to the erection of new episcopal sees and chapters.

Cranmer—the vilified and reviled Cranmer—monster as he was of hypocrisy and wickedness, if we are to believe certain controversialists, was, without doubt, the adviser of Henry in these most laudable foundations; and we must say, with some regret, that had the intentions of Henry VIII. and Cranmer been fully carried out by the bishops and the chapters themselves, the cause of religion would have derived a far greater amount of benefit from cathedral institutions than it actually has.

We are not about to dispute or deny the fact that important benefits, in many ways, have resulted from the cathedral establishments. The solemnity of divine services in these splendid and antique edifices, and the continual offering of praise and prayer each day of the year, are in themselves benefits of no ordinary description; and, without doubt, there have been occasional instances in which learned and pious men have been sustained by the cathedral endowments. This is all very true; but still, if the intention of the founder of so large a number of the English cathedrals had been carried out, the results would have been far more satisfactory. There was a highly ecclesiastical character about these institutions as designed by Henry VIII. and Archbishop Cranmer. Each cathedral body formed a college; each member of which had his allowances, his food, his dwelling, his clothing, from the common fund. There was a common hall, where all partook of their meals together. The society consisted not merely of a dean and presbyter, canons or prebendaries, but also of a deacon and a subdeacon, a schoolmaster, with scholars boarded and taught free of expense; choristers with their teacher; a number of servants, and a body of almsmen, who were supported by the Church. A regular fund was set apart, not only for repairing the church, but also for building bridges and mending causeways, and other charitable works. Poor scholars were to be supported at the universities. In short, the whole foundation was not only connected with the due maintenance of divine worship, but it was conceived on a scale of liberality which was largely to benefit the poor and destitute, and to promote the cause of

Christian education. We must here quote from Mr. Whiston's pamphlet.

"The means and instruments for carrying out these purposes were, in the main, ecclesiastical or collegiate; and a general idea of the scope and nature of the cathedral establishments, as originally planned and settled by Henry VIII., may be formed from the first chapter of the old statutes of Canterbury, which is almost identical with the corresponding chapter of the statutes of all the other cathedrals of the new foundation. It is as follows:

"'On the entire number of those who have their sustentation (qui sustentantur) in the cathedral and metropolitical Church of Canterbury:

"'First of all we ordain and direct that there be for ever in our aforesaid church, one dean, twelve canons, six preachers, twelve minor canons, one deacon, one subdeacon, twelve lay-clerks, one master of the choristers, ten choristers, two teachers of the boys in grammar, one of whom is to be the head master, the other, second master, fifty boys to be instructed in grammar, twelve poor men to be maintained at the costs and charges of the said church, two vergers, two subsacrists (*i. e.* sextons), four servants in the church to ring the bells, and arrange all the rest, two porters, who shall also be barber-tonsors, one caterer, one butler, and one under-butler, one cook, and one under-cook, who, indeed, in the number prescribed, are to serve in our church every one of them in his own order, according to our statutes and ordinances.'

"In the Durham statutes, the corresponding chapter is as follows:

"'On the total number of those who have their sustentation (qui sustentantur) in the cathedral church of Durham:

"'We direct and ordain that there be for ever in the said church, one dean, twelve prebendaries, twelve minor canons, one deacon, one subdeacon, ten clerks, (who may be either priests or laymen,) one master of the choristers, ten choristers, two teachers of the boys in grammar, eighteen boys to be instructed in grammar, eight poor men to be maintained at the costs of the said church, two subsacrists, two vergers, two porters, one of whom shall also be barber-tonsor, one butler, one under-butler, one cook, and one under-cook.'

"The monastic or collegiate characters of the bodies thus constituted, is indicated by the names and offices of the inferior ministers above specified, who were intended to form a part of the establishment of the common hall, in which most of the subordinate members, including the boys to be instructed in grammar, were to take their meals. There was also another point in which the cathedrals were meant to resemble and supply the place of the old religious houses, *i. e.* in the maintenance of a certain number of students at the universities. Thus in the 'general injunctions to be given (A.D. 1535) in the king's highness' behalf to all monasteries, it was ordained that the abbot or president of every religious house should '*keep and fynde*' in some university one or two of his brothers, according to the ability and possessions of his

house: which brethren, after they were learned in good and holy letters, when they returned home, might instruct and teach their brethren, and diligently preach the Word of God.' So again it is recorded, that in the years 1536 and 1547, Henry VIII. commanded that 'every parson, vicar, clerk, or beneficed man, being able to dispend, in benefice or promotion in the Church, 100*l.* or more, should for every of the said 100*l.* yearly, give a *competent exhibition* to *maintain* one scholar, or more, in the grammar schools, or in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge.'

"Accordingly, one result of the suppression of the old monasteries was, that many of the younger monks and friars dependent upon them for support, were obliged to leave the universities, the population of which was considerably thinned in consequence. For this, however, some compensation was made, by imposing upon the new cathedrals the obligation of maintaining at the universities, out of their corporate funds, a certain number of students proportionate to their several possessions, and the number of the foundation scholars in their respective grammar schools. Indeed, the preamble of the act 31 Henry VIII. c. 9, for founding the new cathedrals, preserved in Henry's own handwriting, recites that they were established 'To the *intent* that children might be brought up in learnyng, and clerks noryshed in the universities.' Thus, by his regulation, the church or college of Canterbury was required to maintain (*alere*, *i. e.* to provide alimony for) twenty-four poor students, twelve at Oxford and twelve at Cambridge, the allowance originally granted for this purpose being estates of the value of 200*l.* 'clere by the yere.' So Chester, Ely, Peterborough, and Rochester, were required to maintain each four students in the universities, and Worcester twelve, and Westminster twenty."

In the foundation of new chapters by Henry VIII. there are certain offices mentioned, which it would have been most desirable to have retained, and for the apparent abeyance of which, in the present day, in various cathedrals, we are unable satisfactorily to account. We allude to the *Deacons*. It seems that every chapter founded by Henry VIII. was to have a "deacon and subdeacon," who are called, in some statutes, a "gospeller and epistler,"—the duty of the deacon and subdeacon being to read the Gospel and Epistle.

In the passage just quoted we find amongst the officers as planned and settled by Henry VIII. in the Statutes of the Cathedral and Metropolitical Church of Canterbury, "one deacon, one subdeacon." In the cathedral church of Durham, "one deacon, one subdeacon." Mr. Whiston states that the chapter of the statutes in which these appointments are directed, is almost identically the same in the statutes of all the cathedrals founded by Henry VIII. We find (p. 10) in a scheme for the formation of the college of Canterbury, that the "gospeller" and "epysteller" (or

deacon and subdeacon) were to have salaries of 10*l.* In the original plan for the foundation of the college of Ely (p. 12), we find the names of "Sir John Spirarde, gospeller there, 8*l.*;" and "Sir Thomas Maunde, pistoller there, 8*l.*" So again, in the cathedral of Rochester (p. 17), there were a "deacon and subdeacon, each 6*l.* 11*s.* 10*d.*" In a table prefixed to this pamphlet, and drawn up from a manuscript of the sixteenth century, in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, compared with the cathedral statutes, wherever it was possible, the "deacon and subdeacon" regularly appear in the list of officers of the cathedrals of Canterbury, Rochester, Gloucester, Bristol, Carlisle, Chester, Durham, and Ely, with salaries of different amounts. The list does not mention any such officers at Peterborough, Worcester, or Winchester; and of the remaining cathedrals of the new foundation we have no account in this respect. With reference to the cathedrals of the older foundation, we have no means of judging as to what their regulations were as to the employment of a "deacon and subdeacon;" but we cannot suppose that their rule varied from that adopted in the new cathedrals. Without doubt they all had their deacons and subdeacons also.

Now, with regard to the office of *subdeacon*, it could not of course be expected that any such office should remain in cathedral and collegiate churches, the order having been discontinued at the Reformation; but we should certainly have supposed that the office of *deacon*, being one of the holy orders recognized by the Church of England, would have continued in cathedrals, when Henry VIII., the founder of the majority of those collegiate bodies, expressly mentions them in his statutes given to his cathedrals. But we have looked in vain through the lists of cathedral and collegiate officers in the clergy list to find any such office as that of *deacon*. Throughout the whole list of cathedral functionaries comprised in the Clergy List, we can only find a single instance in which the offices of gospeller and epistler appointed by King Henry VIII. are still retained. This honourable exception is to be found at Norwich. Every where else, as far as we can see, the offices of gospeller and epistler, or deacon and subdeacon, have wholly disappeared. We have some notion of having heard of "gospeller and epistler" in some other cathedral; but of "deacon" we have never heard as existing in any English cathedral within our own times.

It appears from the following passage in Mr. Whiston's pamphlet (p. 46), that at the commencement of Queen Elizabeth's reign a power was given to *withdraw the salaries* paid to the deacon and subdeacon, in favour of the divinity lecturer:—

"Her royal father, Henry VIII., reserved to himself and his suc-

cessors, full power and authority to alter the original statutes of his cathedrals, and even to frame new ones. Still she did not avail herself of this power, when it was found necessary to adapt those statutes to the worship of the reformed faith, until an Act of Parliament had been passed empowering her to do so. Royal commissioners were then appointed for this purpose, and among their amendments are two which bear upon the question of suppressions. One of them occurs in Cap. XXI. of the Corpus Christi Coll. MS., intituled 'De Lectore Theologico,' and is as follows :—

"'The reader in theology shall have for his stipend 20*l.* at least; and that this may be the more easily paid, we *allow* the stipends which have heretofore been paid to the deacon and subdeacon, to be paid for the future to the said reader; and if their stipend shall not amount to the said sum of 20*l.*, let the dean and chapter be bound to supply the remainder.' Now this injunction, it will be seen, does any thing but allow to a chapter the privilege of suppressing the offices of deacon and subdeacon, and appropriating their stipends to any other purpose except the provision for a reader in theology."

Now, this direction, *so far as it was acted on*, doubtless left the office of deacon in cathedrals without payment from the cathedral funds; but, at the same time, there is no evidence that it was intended to suppress the office itself, and it need not have been suppressed, and we presume that in all cathedrals of King Henry's foundation, at least, it is merely in abeyance at this moment. But when we look at the constitution of the cathedral bodies, we cannot but be under the impression, that in many instances there are funds which are still applicable to the purpose of maintaining deacons, as far as they go. For we do not see the office of *Divinity Lecturer*, which was permitted to absorb the deacon's income, extant except in a very few of the cathedrals. We only find lecturers on divinity in Ely, Hereford, and Westminster. Of the latter we do not feel quite certain, as we know not whether the office of "Term lecturer," mentioned as amongst the collegiate offices, is the same as that of "divinity lecturer."

Since, therefore, the office of divinity lecturer only exists in two or three of the chapters out of thirty, we think there is reason to suppose that the office of deacon has not been legally divested of its revenues in all cases, and that it might be revived in many, if not all, of our cathedral and collegiate churches.

We are not disposed to enter into the feelings with which Mr. Whiston evidently regards cathedral bodies in general. There can be no doubt that the character of the system contemplated by their founders has widely altered in the course of ages; and we certainly cannot exonerate from blame, in some respects, those who, in former ages, unnecessarily deviated from the direc-

tions of founders. At the same time, it would surely be unreasonable to regard the chapters as deserving of peculiar blame in this respect, for it will be found that all corporate bodies and all institutions have a tendency to change and alteration either in essentials or non-essentials; and looking to the perpetual system of alteration in the various parts of the Constitution, and the various foundations for educational and charitable purposes, we think that any candid and just mind will not be disposed to regard the chapters of the present day as exhibiting any such case of deviation from the regulations of their founders, as should render them peculiarly deserving of public reprobation. The alterations which have been introduced have been the slow growth of centuries, and are not the acts of our present deans and canons.

Having said thus much in vindication of the chapters from imputations which are somewhat unjustly thrown on them, we must still be permitted to express an opinion, that where it is possible to carry out the designs of founders, without any manifest inconvenience, or injustice, they ought strictly to be attended to; and we do very earnestly press upon the attention of the chapters the question, whether they ought not to restore the office of deacon in their cathedrals, and thus not merely carry out the wishes of their founders, but supply a defect in our present hierarchical arrangements—the office of deacon being no where in existence as a distinct office. We feel assured that there are many members of chapters who must feel an interest in such a question, and who would, with a view to the general interests of the Church of England, endeavour to remedy the defect referred to.

The collegiate character of these institutions has been almost entirely lost in the course of time. Originally, the canons, minor canons, singing men, choristers, scholars, and inferior officers of each cathedral, appear to have lived within the precincts of the cathedral, and partaken of their meals together in the hall, as is still customary in colleges at the universities. The establishment of the various chapters founded by Henry VIII. included the following grades of office:—a dean, vice-dean, treasurer, sacrist, precentor, prebendaries or canons, minor canons, preachers, deacon and subdeacon, master of the school, organist, undermaster, lay clerks, subsacrists or sextons, vergers, bellringers, barbitonsors and porters, choristers, grammar boys, students, bedesmen or almsmen, a receiver, a seneschal, an auditor, caterers, butlers or manciples, cooks, under-cooks. The number of names "on the books" of the college might amount to one hundred, or one hundred and fifty, or even more. It was, in fact, quite as numerous a body as an ordinary-sized college at one

of the universities. The cathedral was the college chapel, and its officers in themselves, with their families, must have formed a tolerable congregation.

We must confess that we think there is much cause for regret that this collegiate character has been lost. It is to be lamented that the canons of cathedrals were not tied down to constant residence at the cathedral, and to a collegiate life. Had they been prevented from holding other benefices in plurality, and thereby absenting themselves from the cathedral, and had the cure of souls in the cathedral city been restored to them, we should have had, perhaps, as desirable a state of things as could well have been imagined. To place a body of clergy in a cathedral close, without any duties except those of attending the cathedral service, would not, we are persuaded, have been beneficial to those clergy themselves, or to the Church generally. It would have put them in an unnatural position, and have divested them of the highest privileges of their office, and would, therefore, probably have tended to produce habits of sloth and self-indulgence. But could these institutions have been continued in the collegiate form contemplated by their founders, and restored to the original uses of cathedral bodies, *i. e.* to the cure of souls, the results would have probably been most salutary to the Church.

But the question will arise, after all, in the mind, To what causes are we to attribute such alterations in the cathedral system—alterations which are plainly not desirable in themselves, and which all, apparently, tend to the promotion of the ease or profit of individuals, without much regard to the public welfare? We do not mean to enter into all the matters of complaint which Mr. Whiston has advanced. We can only allude to the complaints which are made, that the minor canons, schoolmasters, singing men, organists, and other inferior officers of cathedrals, as well as the choristers, and grammar scholars, the students, bedesman, &c. are either entirely discontinued, or paid inadequately, and less than the founders intended, while the whole increase in the value of cathedral property has been absorbed by the dean and canons, and the patronage of the benefices in the gift of each chapter, has become a matter of private accommodation to their members for the preferment of their own families. We need not refer to the fact that the dean of a metropolitan cathedral was actually deprived a few years since in consequence of his practice of selling the presentations of livings in his gift, and merely escaped in consequence of an oversight in the process for his removal. We naturally ask, What is the cause of such serious defects and abuses as have certainly grown up? What

is the cause of that *worldly spirit* which has so extensively existed in cathedral establishments, and which has led to their downfall?

In the first place we must say, with great regret, that those whose especial duty it was to exercise a systematic supervision of the chapters have not adequately felt the extent of their duties in this respect. Visitations of chapters have been rarely held. In the trial of the Dean of York, it appeared that the late Archbishop of York had never held a visitation of his cathedral church, during an episcopate of thirty years, until he was obliged to hold one for the purpose of correcting abuses which had become unbearable and notorious. We apprehend that visitations of chapters have been exceedingly rare occurrences in this country. We never remember, at least, to have heard of such a visitation, except in the case of the Dean of York, in which inquiry was regularly and minutely made whether the statutes of the Church were observed.

Now this ought not to have been so. The founders of cathedrals certainly expected the bishops, who are visitors of those societies, to discharge their office without fear or favour, and with sufficient frequency. We cite the following extract from the Statutes of the Cathedral of Rochester, founded by King Henry VIII., as given in Mr. Whiston's pamphlet, p. 120:—

"Statute XXXVII. On the visitation of the Church:—

"There is no work so piously begun, so prosperously continued, so faithfully consummated, but that it is easily undermined, and by carelessness and negligence overthrown. No statutes are framed so sacred and firm, but that by length of time they come into oblivion and contempt, unless there be kept up continued watchfulness and zeal of piety. And that this indeed may never come to pass or possibly happen in our Church, *We* relying upon the *faithfulness* and *diligence* of the Bishop of Rochester for the time being, *do* constitute him visitor of our cathedral church of Rochester, willing and commanding that with Christian faith and ardent zeal of piety he do *watch and industriously take care*, that these statutes and ordinances of our Church published by us be *inviolably observed*, and its rights, liberties, and privileges defended and maintained. And that this may be so, We ordain and will, that the bishop himself so often as he shall be requested by the dean, or by the canons, nay, even *if not requested, do, at any rate once in every three years*, in his own person (unless a great necessity hinder him), and if not, by his chancellor, *visit* our Church, and summon the dean, the canons, the minor canons, the lay clerks, and all the other officers of our Church to a suitable place. And by virtue of this present statute, we grant the bishop full power and authority to interrogate the dean, canons, &c. about all and singular the articles comprised in our statutes, and about any other articles soever concerning the condition, advantage, or honour of our Church, and to compel every one of them,

on his oath, to tell the actual truth of the Church. And with respect to all delinquencies and charges, of any kind soever, let the bishop *punish and reform them*, when discovered and proved, according to the measure of the delinquency and charge, and *do all* things which shall seem necessary for *the reformation of abuses*, and which shall be determined to pertain by right to the office of a visitor. And we will and command that, as well the dean as the canons, and the other officers of our Church, do in all the premises obey the bishop himself. Moreover, because we *wish* these our *statutes to continue for ever*, if any dissension shall hereafter arise between the dean and canons, about the true meaning of our statutes, *all of which we will should be understood according to their plain and grammatical sense*, We will and decree, that any clause of a statute about which the controversy shall arise, be referred to the Archbishop of Canterbury, by whose interpretation, *if not contrary to our statutes*, we order those who have doubted to stand and obey it. Nevertheless, we *forbid* the *visitor* and the expounder of our statutes and all others, of whatsoever dignity and authority, to make any new statutes or *dispense with any one.* We also forbid the *dean and the canons of our Church* from *receiving* statutes of this kind, under the *penalty* of *perjury* and *perpetual removal from our Church.*"

The author of statutes like this certainly provided, as far as language can go, for the perpetual observance of his regulations. But he had, after all, to depend upon human instrumentality in carrying his designs into effect, and hence they have been subject to the vicissitudes experienced by other institutions. The visitors appointed by his statutes were indulgent and easy men, or else confided the management of cathedrals to their deans and canons. They were satisfied to leave the observance of the statutes to the good feeling of the members of chapters, and only interfered when appealed to in some particular case. The result of such an indulgent course of proceeding was, of course, that the statutes were neglected in various points, and deviations from the founder's injunctions became gradually customary and universal. The chapters have had their share of responsibility for their departing from the regulations which they were pledged to adhere to; but then the bishops have been scarcely less responsible, because, if they had discharged their office of visitors, the statutes would have been upheld. There are some remarks on this subject in Mr. Whiston's pamphlet which deserve transcribing.

" Very apposite, also, are the words of Mr. Hope, the eloquent advocate of the chapters, on this same subject of episcopal visitation. They were spoken in the House of Lords a short time before the Bishop of Rochester pleaded his oath as a reason for not supporting the measure which Mr. Hope opposed, and they deserve quoting, not only as being full of truth, but as expressing the feelings of a well-informed friend of

deans and chapters, and conveying a warning to them in terms reproachful, indeed, but instructive, if not prophetic.

"'Now, my lords,' he said, 'I fully admit that they (the bishops) have considerable power over the institutions as visitors of them; and *most deeply* do I wish that the bishops of this Church in the last century had applied themselves to their ordinary and legitimate power in this respect. Had they done so, those bodies would at this time have held so high a station in the opinion of the country, that it would have been impossible that we should ever have had a measure such as this suggested to us. But this is the way in which we proceed in all our modern reformations. First, we neglect and abuse the institutions of our ancestors; and then we turn upon them in anger, or in hastiness, and destroy that as useless which it only rested with ourselves to make most useful.' And if this is true generally; most assuredly has it rested with visitors and deans and chapters to make our cathedral institutions most useful and most popular; a support to the Church, and a blessing to the nation; objects of veneration with the rich, and of grateful affection with the poor; and such they might have made them by simply and honestly fulfilling the will of the founder, and carrying out faithfully his injunctions. Instead of this, cathedrals have been suffered to exemplify the good old law, that those should keep who can; whereas they ought to have been enduring and unchanging patterns of whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are of good report."

We have, therefore, the authority of Mr. Hope for stating, that the tacit abrogation of many of the statutes of the cathedrals has been the fault of those who were bound by the statutes, and by considerations still higher than those founded on any such human authority, to a vigilant inspection of the capitular bodies. And must we not attribute to the same cause the decay of discipline generally? How many of the canons and rubrics have become obsolete in practice, though they are still legally binding, and have never been abrogated by any authority. In this case, as in that of the cathedral statutes, no small amount of responsibility rests on the hierarchy of former generations; and (shall we say it?) of the present generation also. For it is a very great difficulty in the way of any faithful member of the Church, who may wish to obey what the Church has directed, and what has never been abrogated by any authority, to find, that preceding prelates have acquiesced in deviations from the Church's rules, and that the chief pastor who is set over him, is following in their footsteps. He is placed in a position which he ought not to be required to occupy. He has to take a course which is a tacit reproof to others, and even to his own spiritual superior; and he has to advocate the claims of authority, while authority is not maintained by its living representatives. The result of ill-judged

indulgence or want of zeal amongst the rulers of the Church in past generations is, that obedience to the Church's directions, however good and reasonable in themselves, is held to be an innovation. This is not as it should be.

But then, another question here suggests itself. How has it happened that the bishops of the Church have been men of such easy dispositions, or have shown so moderate an amount of zeal in behalf of the Church's institutions and directions? The reason is evident. It arises from the system of appointment to bishopries which has grown up within the last century and a half. As soon as bishoprics passed away from the patronage of the Crown (which was anxious, for reasons of State, to secure the appointment of the most deserving men as bishops) to that of the Prime Minister, there could not be any room for hoping that any qualifications would be regarded except those which were connected either with personal or political considerations. Accordingly so it has been too commonly; and under these circumstances we could only have an episcopate whose zeal for the Church was of a very limited description, and with whom the care of the temporalities of their sees and of the Church generally was a primary consideration. So convinced are we of the mischief of ministerial appointments to bishoprics, that we would gladly give up all the temporal advantages enjoyed by our episcopate, including their endowments and their seats in Parliament, if the State would consent on these terms to transfer the election of bishops from the hands of the Minister of the day, to some body or bodies in which the majority of the Church should agree to place it. The present system has a tendency to set aside that qualification without which all others are of no avail—religious earnestness. A minister—a man of the world, will never, if he can help it, appoint a priest of well-known zeal and devotion to the episcopal bench. He may appoint a learned or an able man to some office in the Church, in order to acquire the character of a patron of classical or other learning. He may appoint men of no decided character, in order to provide pliable instruments for carrying out government measures. He may appoint personal friends without regard to qualification; and may find himself obliged, with equal unscrupulousness, to nominate the relatives or friends of members of the government. But in this, as in all other cases, in which the real objects of appointments are not attended to, but are superseded by other considerations, the necessary result must be that, on the whole, the objects themselves suffer. If the command of armies or fleets in a war were dispensed, not with a view to the real fitness of the commanders selected, to carry out the great objects of the nation, but with reference to family interest, or politics only, the interests

of the State would suffer. And so it must be with the Church, when her commands are distributed without reference to positive qualifications. To fill the office of a Christian bishop none but an *apostolical* man—a man of purity, zeal, humility, charity, wisdom, should be sought for. These are the first and most essential considerations, which we say, with grief, are, notoriously, never made the subject of consideration by those to whom the appointment of bishops is entrusted; and we have had to lament, in consequence, the apathy of a century and a half—the relaxation of sound discipline—the decline of sound learning—the laxity of religious opinion verging towards philosophical indifference—the discontinuance of synods—the abeyance of much of the episcopal office—the discouragement of more lively and earnest devotion—the misapplication of ecclesiastical patronage—and other evils of many descriptions.

We wish to see the Church in the most perfect harmony and alliance with the State, as far as the State will permit the alliance; but we object to any system which tends to make the Church the slave of the State, or which impairs her health, by infecting her leading and noblest organs with the spirit of the world. It is against the intrusion of the spirit of worldliness into high places that all members of the Church are bound to protest. We would rather see error itself than apathy and lukewarmness. The one might be resisted and exposed; but the other is a less assailable evil, and yet a more eating canker. Hence it meets with the severest reprobation from God, in terms which suit the case of every worldly intruder into the office of the supreme care of souls. "I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth. Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked: I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see. As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten: be zealous therefore, and repent."

This language was addressed by St. John to the bishop of the Church of the Laodiceans; and it has been, doubtless, applicable to many other bishops since that time. And, in general, it is a solemn and awful warning against the growth of the spirit of worldliness amongst rulers and dignitaries in the Church.

This is no question between one set of opinions and another:

it is a question which concerns the existence of religion in general. It is whether religious earnestness and devotion to the cause of Christ is to prevail, or whether the spirit of the world, which is *opposed* to Christ, is to prevail. We are deeply convinced that to place the nomination of the heads of the Church in the hand of mere politicians, is to taint it at its source. True it is, that pure water sometimes comes forth from that impure fountain; and we have continually to pray that the grace of God may be extended to those who have been called in His providence to the highest offices in the ministry. But it is not possible to avoid the conviction, that State patronage, as exercised by prime ministers, has been, for a long series of years, amongst the greatest, though most quiet and unsuspected, evils from which the cause of Christianity has been suffering in this country. We are satisfied that this feeling is extensively prevalent amongst Churchmen, whatever may be the difference of their views in some respects. More especially does it exist amongst those of the laity who have been enabled by their position in the world to see something of the working of the present system, and to ascertain the motives and principles of selection which actuate ministers in their appointments to ecclesiastical benefices. The disgust of such men is very great at what they have seen and known; and it may be, that the tendency in their minds would be, in some instances, to desire the removal of all those temporal distinctions and advantages with which the episcopate is surrounded, in the hope of rendering it an object of less value in the eyes of politicians and of worldly clergymen. The speeches of Mr. Horsman in parliament exhibit something of this spirit; and the manner in which they have been received in parliament and in the country, shows what is working in the minds of many amongst us.

There is something in Mr. Horsman's tone which appears to be at times too harsh and violent; and we feel uneasy in perusing some of his details, which appear rather too personal. Still, on the whole, we are inclined to hope that Mr. Horsman, though somewhat unscrupulous in his mode of attack, and perhaps somewhat hasty in adopting some of his inferences, is actuated by a desire to promote the efficiency of the Church in general. In the "Five Speeches" which we have mentioned above, Mr. Horsman's chief subject of complaint is the alleged faults of the ecclesiastical commissioners in the administration of the funds placed at their disposal. According to his statements, the commissioners, who include all the episcopal bench in their number, have permitted the bishops of various sees to receive incomes which amount to 26,000*l.* a year above the sum intended by the

legislature, the wealthier sees paying less than they ought in the way of contribution, and the poorer sees being more liberally aided than was contemplated. The large sums expended on episcopal residences by the ecclesiastical commissioners are also referred to; and the whole is contrasted with the comparatively small amount of money employed in the augmentation of new parochial benefices and the erection of parsonage-houses. The unfavourable impression created by this disposition on the part of the commissioners to provide for their own pecuniary interests appears to have been one of the principal motives which influenced Mr. Horsman in opposing the erection of the see of Manchester and the three other sees proposed by government. But at the same time we are glad to see that he is far from being opposed to the appointment of new bishops, provided their incomes are on a moderate scale. The following passage contains important matter:—

"Her Majesty's ministers have not explained to us wherein lies the necessity for these bishops, or the number which they consider eventually desirable. It is evident they do not stop at four; but we hear in other quarters, and some of them of high authority, that there is a need for 4000 more clergymen, and of sixty additional bishops to make the work of superintendence efficient and complete. How can they ever expect to get any thing approaching that number? And is it desirable they should, whatever be the necessity, if the new bishops were to be of the same order as those we have already? I think the distance in this country between rich and poor is too great everywhere, but no where is the gulf so wide and so deplorable as between the prelates and their clergy. If you must have more bishops, they must be of that order which the Member for the University has suggested—an order more in accordance with the feelings and necessities of the time, and through whom the benefits you desire might be safely and effectually attained. In the Church's earlier days suffragan bishops were an useful and efficient body; and their appointment, the necessity once proved, would not be so unpopular as increasing the number of your baronial prelates. The Hon. Baronet apprehended there might be some difficulty about the payment. I think I can show how to overcome that.

"Take at once the whole number of bishops you desire—take sixty suffragans;—place them in the great towns and populous districts, with ample, not extravagant salaries, say 1500*l.* a year,—requiring in all 90,000*l.* a year. Dividing then our population of sixteen millions into eighty-six districts, there would thus be about 186,000 in each, and so far the amount of superintendence would be well adjusted.

"But then comes the payment; and on this point the Member for the University of Oxford anticipated difficulty. I am prepared to show how it may be got over, and in this way.

"No one can have cast his eye over our cathedral towns without

observing how little their great establishments contribute to the sacred purposes for which they were intended. Not only have the Church services degenerated into cold and unimpressive forms, so as to lead virtually to a discontinuance of congregational attendance, but the system of non-residences and pluralities, abolished every where else, has an effect decidedly injurious to religion. It is notorious that in our cathedral towns there is the least education and the most Dissent. Now I propose to attempt some remedy for this.

"And I do so upon the plan suggested by one who must be held a very high authority, since it was to him that the Government were indebted for their measure in 1836. Every leading provision of their Act was taken from Lord Henley; on one practical point only did they materially depart from his suggestions, and that was on the constitution of the commission, in which experience has proved that he was right. In Lord Henley's plan of Church Reform, accompanied by a letter to the King in 1832, he makes this proposal, with regard to the cathedrals:—

"'In the administration of the cathedral property, the first consideration which naturally arises, is that due consideration be made for the celebration of cathedral service. For this purpose (as one great object will be the abolition of every thing approaching to a sinecure, that can be dispensed with,) it will be most convenient to entrust the performance of divine service exclusively to the dean, assisted by such a number of chaplains as shall be deemed necessary. As his residence will be for nine months in the year, he shall perform the same quantity of public duty as the incumbents of our great London livings. But as there will be no occasional duty—no registries to be kept—no vestries to attend—no visiting of the poor and sick, his labours will be extremely slight.'

"In each cathedral now there is a dean whose average income is 1680*l.*—four canons with average incomes of 800*l.*—and six minor canons, each with 150*l.* Reckoning the cathedrals at twenty-six (there are more, but one or two may be poorer than I have said), the return stands thus:—

	Average Income.	Total.
26 Deans	£1680	£43,680
104 Canons	800	83,200
156 Minor Canons	150	23,400

"Now if, in accordance with Lord Henley's proposal, we reduce this establishment to a dean with 1000*l.* a year, and the minor canons, we shall leave 1900*l.* a year for the cathedral services, and have the following surplus:—

	Incomes.	Surplus.
Deans 26	£26,000	£17,680
Canons 0	0	83,200
Minor Canons 106	23,400	
		£100,880

"Here, therefore, is a sum of 100,000*l.*; more than sufficient for the most extravagant number of suffragans that would be wanted. The advantages of this plan would be threefold—First, you get the whole amount now paid to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners' Episcopal and Common Fund, for the augmentation of poor livings. Secondly, you bring in your cathedrals to aid the general wants of the country, establishing a resident clergy, between whom and their congregation ties and sympathies are formed, and you elevate the tone of your cathedral service. Thirdly, you get, if you need them, more bishops, and without any difficulty either as to number or payment. Prove the necessity before Parliament, and it will thus supply your deficiency by an addition to the episcopacy of an efficient and popular body, who will form a link between the prelates and the clergy—aiding the one, controlling and encouraging the other.

"While, however, I express this preference for suffragan bishops, supposing more bishops to be needful, I think I have given a picture of parochial destitution sufficient to prove that the evil is of a very different character, and needs a very different remedy. Our first thought must be for our parochial poor: our first duty is to bring home religious instruction to them. Of this too I am quite sure, that an enlargement of the episcopacy would not alone make it more efficient."

This passage brings us back to the subject of cathedral establishments, in which, as we have already seen, very great and undesirable alterations have been permitted to take place. The collegiate character has been allowed to fall wholly into abeyance, and a number of offices contemplated by the founders have been suppressed. Funds destined for charitable objects have long ceased to be so applied. We lament these alterations extremely, but we fear the time is gone by for the revival of the cathedral system, according to the plans of the founders of chapters. It has been too long permitted to remain in abeyance, and the whole body of cathedral dignitaries have been accustomed to so totally different a view of the case, that we cannot look on a return to the original constitution as feasible. The cathedral bodies have, for a long series of years, stood before the world as complete sinecurists, and generally as the most opulent of the clergy, without any higher personal claims than their brethren. Appointed by political friends or by relatives, they have been too commonly guided by considerations of the same kind in dispensing the large patronage entrusted to them. And the result of all has been, that the chapters have had no hold upon the public mind—no services to appeal to—no practical usefulness to show—so that they have been unable to resist the alienation of their funds to objects of a more obviously useful character. And we earnestly hope that, in the end, they may not entirely perish, but be restored to that cure of souls in

the cathedral city of which they ought never to have been divested, and which would have ensured their residence in the sphere of their duties, and prevented them from holding benefices in plurality. The cathedrals have been ousted of their rights by parish churches in cities. Though nominally the parish church of the whole diocese, the cathedral has actually no cure of souls annexed to it. Why should not the surrounding parishes be brought once again into connexion with the cathedral and its clergy? One of Mr. Horsman's most effective speeches is taken up almost entirely with statistics, intended to show the very small number of persons who avail themselves of daily service at the cathedrals. Perhaps, if he had extended his inquiries to Sunday services, the number in attendance might still have seemed small in comparison with the capacity of the cathedrals. And yet this is, after all, the fault of the system of the Church in reference to the cathedrals, and is not to be attributed wholly to the chapters. Is it not a fact that the whole of each cathedral city is parcelled out into parishes, each with its parish church and priest; and is not the ecclesiastical system, therefore, so arranged in those places, that the whole of the inhabitants are virtually drawn away from the cathedral? Is not the cathedral necessarily left *without a congregation*, except as it is made up by cathedral officials and their families, and casual visitors? This is really and simply the fact. If the cathedrals have not as good congregations as parish churches, it is because they have ceased to be in any sense parish churches; because they have lost the cure of souls, which they had for a thousand or twelve hundred years, or, in some cases, still later.

Art. VI.—1. *Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education, with Appendixes.* 1847-8-9. *England and Wales. Schools of Parochial Unions. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty.* London. Printed by Clowes and Sons for Her Majesty's Stationery Office. 1849.

2. *Return to an Address of The Honourable the House of Commons, dated July 21st,* 1849, *for a copy of so much of the Minutes of the Committee of Council as relates to the establishment of Normal Schools for Training Masters for Workhouse-Schools, together with a Statement of the Measures which have been taken in consequence for providing buildings for that purpose, the sums expended in giving effect to the said Minute, and the Funds out of which the expenditure has been defrayed.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, Aug. 1st, 1849.

In the year 1839 an attempt was made, as our readers are aware, to lay the foundations of a system of so-called National Education, the supreme direction of which was to centre in a Government Education Board—the Committee of Council on Education,—to the exclusion of the Bishops of the National Church, to whose province the superintendence of National Education properly belongs. One of the leading features of the scheme was the essentially secular character of the education to be imparted; religious instruction was carefully distinguished from the general tuition of the school, to be admitted under such restrictions and regulations as must have rendered it, practically, altogether nugatory; the avowed object being to substitute for the national faith, of which the Church is the witness and guardian, a colourless, tasteless compound, nicknamed "general religion." This notable scheme, after being concocted in the dark, was brought forward, not by any of the constitutional methods usually employed in adjusting our institutions, but by a novel mode of proceeding, half-administrative and half-legislative, in the unobtrusive form of a letter addressed by one member of the Government to another. Lord John Russell, at that period Secretary of State for the Home Department, broke ground by a letter to the Lord President, then as now the Marquis of Lansdowne, who in his reply entered into further explanations, which were followed up by a Minute of the Committee of Council. The minute having been duly recorded, the scheme was considered *un fait accompli*, and the only

thing remaining to be done was an application to Parliament for the necessary funds.

Unfortunately for the ministerial contrivance, there was more vigilance and firmness in the legislature of that day than had been calculated upon; the correspondence and minute had scarcely come to the knowledge of Parliament, when the most determined opposition was at once set on foot; and, while the grant passed the Lower House with a majority so slender as to amount in reality to a defeat, the Upper House supported the late Primate with an overwhelming majority in his solemn protest against the contemplated encroachment upon the religious character of the education to be imparted to the rising generation. The result was the compact of 1840, the guarantees of which have been frittered away piecemeal in the subsequent controversies between the Committee of Council and the National Society; the former body framing, under the *inspiration* of Mr. Kay Shuttleworth, Minute after Minute, in contravention, not of the spirit only, but of the very letter of the terms agreed to by the Church. Still, however cunningly the engagements of the educational treaty of 1840 were evaded, and however insidiously the distinction between secular and religious education was introduced into the management of Church Schools by the Committee of Council, the last-named body was restricted to the position assigned to it by the compact—that of a body charged with the distribution of the Parliamentary Grant, and exercising, in consideration of it, a certain degree of supervision over all schools, whether belonging to the Established Church, or to other religious denominations, which obtained a share of the public money voted for educational purposes. The idea of a State machinery of education, distinct from that of the Church and of other religious bodies, under the immediate direction of the Committee of Council, appeared to be fairly given up, in deference to the will of Parliament, and to the unequivocally expressed sense of the country at large.

Will it be believed, that the scheme which the resistance of Parliament, and especially that of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, backed by the House of Lords, effectually obstructed in the year 1839, has actually been carried into effect in 1849, unsuspected by the legislature and the country. Yet such is the astounding fact. An official report, recently published, exhibits the plan in question in a state of complete organization, and in full operation. A normal school for the training of teachers, separated from all connexion with the Church,—a body of inspectors, placed, like the normal school, under the immediate superintendence of the Committee of Council,—and a system of centralization, which, through this normal school, and through the

inspection connected with it, gives to that unconstitutional board of education a footing in every parish in England and Wales,—such is the machinery for introducing a purely secular education into the country, which has been clandestinely prepared under the auspices of the Committee of Council. The remarkable talent of the Secretary of the Committee, for achieving important measures by "unobtrusive" methods, has been brought into full play on this occasion; for, although the general outline of the proposed scheme is contained, intermixed with other "extracts," in the Minutes of the Committee of Council of 1846, no suspicion of the real character of the design was entertained, until in July last the "John Bull" newspaper sounded the alarm in an article, founded apparently upon information obtained through some private channel, from which we borrow the following statement of the leading facts of the case:—

"Among the sums appropriated in the Education Grant of the present year there is an amount of 18,000*l.* for Kneller Hall, Twickenham. On inquiry it turns out that this 'Hall' is intended as a Normal School for the training of schoolmasters for Union Houses, upon the system contemplated in 1839, of excluding all religious tenets from the general teaching of the school, admitting religious instruction only as an 'extra,'—like dancing, fencing, or music, in fashionable boarding-schools,—out of regular school hours. This infidel college is to be committed to the direction of a Mr. Temple, who acts at present as substitute for Mr. Kay Shuttleworth at the Council Office, as Principal, and of a Mr. Palgrave, a clerk in the Privy Council Office, as Vice-Principal, and is to come forthwith into active operation.

"That this is but the beginning of a more extensive scheme for undermining the religious education of the country, is obvious. One such Training College being once established, others will follow in due time; and as the Committee of Council have ample means and opportunities of impeding the extension of Diocesan and other Training Schools founded upon a religious basis, not only by withholding or curtailing the money-grants hitherto made to such institutions, but by giving a decided preference in the scheme of Government remuneration provided for by the Minutes of August and December, 1846, to the masters trained at their 'universal' halls of knowledge, over those educated in 'sectarian' institutions, it is easy to foresee that infidel schoolmasters from the Government Training School will, by degrees and 'unostentatiously,' find their way into many other schools besides those for which ostensibly Kneller Hall has been set on foot. Thus in another generation we may expect to see the country overrun by a host of secular schoolmasters dependent on the Council Office, who shall, in every parish where they can find admittance, form a counterpoise to the influence of the Church, and be turned, as occasion may serve, into electioneering agents and preachers of political doctrines, as has recently been done both in Germany and in France, the parochial teachers edu-

cated on the principle of no religion being among the most active and dangerous promoters of the democratic movement.

"What renders this renewed attempt to revolutionize the education of the country still more profligate, is the fact, that, before any indication of it was permitted to appear in the educational estimates, the establishment of the godless College had been actually accomplished. No less a sum than thirty thousand pounds, we have been assured, has already been expended upon Kneller Hall, the amount being supplied from the funds at the disposal of the Poor-Law Commissioners; whether by way of permanent appropriation out of that fund, or by way of loan to be replaced out of the Education Grant, we have been unable to ascertain. In either case, the compact entered into in 1839, on the subject of education, has been grossly violated, and even the very inadequate control exercised by the annual money vote of the Lower House of Parliament has been effectually got rid of by a discreditable juggle, in order to enable the Government to foist upon the country a theory of education which was not only repudiated by the solemn decision of the Legislature ten years ago, but stands at this moment condemned before all the world, by the frightful fruits which it has borne on the Continent of Europe."—*John Bull, July 7th,* 1849.

In confirmation of these observations we have now lying before us an octavo volume of between 300 and 400 pages (51 pages text, and 315 pages appendix) and a scanty Parliamentary return of two folio pages,—the official publications cited at the head of this article,—which, with the characteristic coolness and reserve observable in the revelations vouchsafed from time to time by the Committee of Council, acquaint us with much that is no less surprising than novel, while they leave us in the dark on a variety of points on which clear and detailed information is greatly to be desired. Such as they are, however, we propose to give our readers a brief analysis of their contents.

At the outset of the volume containing the Minutes of the Committee of Council, we have the Cabinet soliloquizing, as in 1839,—the most convenient method, undoubtedly, of legislating on a subject which, in Parliament, would not fail to give rise to the most strenuous opposition. Instead of encountering the hostile opinions of those who are still bold enough to stand up in the senate in defence of our national faith, the Secretary of State for the Home Department—this time not Lord John Russell, but Sir George Grey—addresses a letter, dated "18th November, 1846," to the Lord President of the Council, being, as he says, "desirous of bringing under his lordship's notice the subject of the appropriation of sums granted by Parliament towards defraying the expenses of salaries of schoolmasters and schoolmistresses for the children of the destitute in Poor-Law Unions in England and Wales;"—the first grant for this purpose having been made for

the half-year ending 31st March, 1847, and the Home Secretary "anticipating" that similar grants will be made in future years. From this exordium it might be supposed that the Lord President was scarcely cognizant of this parliamentary grant; but this would be a great mistake. It would rather appear as if the whole subject had been fully canvassed before between the Lord President and the Home Secretary, and that of the result of their deliberations, as much as was thought expedient, was now thrown into a form fit to be hereafter officially communicated to Parliament.

"I am aware," says the letter, "from the communications which have taken place between your lordship and myself on this subject, that you entirely concur in the importance of rendering the application of such grants conducive to the increased efficiency of workhouse-schools; and I think that this object may be very materially promoted by the assistance of the Committee of Council on Education."—*Minutes*, p. xiv.

The Home Secretary, to whose department the subject of poor-law unions, and consequently of workhouse-schools, belongs, thinks the Committee of Council on Education (of which he himself is a member) might assist him; and with a view to secure that assistance he addresses himself to the Lord President as the chairman of the Committee of Council. He does not do so, however, like a man who does not know what he wants, or what he would be about; on the contrary, he has the plan of the assistance he requires all ready cut and dried. The plan, in fact, has been concocted by the Committee of Council on Education; and it has been adopted by the Home Secretary simply with a view to relieve the Committee of Council of the appearance of dictatorial interference, by making the interposition of its authority for enacting its own schemes look like a favour done to another department of the State.

"I inclose to your lordship," the letter continues, "a paper *addressed to me*[1] by Mr. Kay Shuttleworth, containing some valuable suggestions on this subject; and I would request that this paper may be submitted for the consideration of the Committee of Council, with a view to the adoption of such measures as, upon consideration, shall appear best calculated to improve the character of the instruction given in the workhouse-schools. I entirely agree in the opinion expressed by Mr. Kay Shuttleworth, that the inspection of these schools cannot properly be discharged amidst the other urgent claims on the time and attention of Assistant Poor Law Commissioners; and I think it is very desirable that this duty should be confided to persons of knowledge and experience, whose time could be devoted to it, and who should be selected for

[1] The title of the paper itself is, "Paper prepared *at the request* of the Right Hon. Sir George Grey," &c. &c.

the office by the Committee of Council [2]. The establishment of a normal school, for the training of masters for workhouse-schools, is another point of the utmost importance. The establishment of a school of this character, for training masters for prison schools, is also under my consideration; and, although it is essential that the two classes of children should be kept totally separate, the qualifications of the instructors would be the same, and it would probably tend to the efficiency, as well as the economy, of the arrangement, if the two objects were to be combined, and one good normal school established for training masters for both purposes. If your lordship should concur in this opinion, I would propose that the requisite steps should be taken, under the direction of the Committee of Council, and with the sanction of the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, for the formation of such schools. The choice of a site, and the details of the arrangements, may best be considered when the subject comes before the Committee."—*Minutes*, pp. xiv. xv.

Here, then, by the simple interchange of the "opinions" of three individuals, the Lord President, the Home Secretary, and Mr. Kay Shuttleworth, we arrive by a short cut at the establishment of that which Parliament struggled against most vigorously, when first proposed, viz.:—

1. The subjection of all the workhouse-schools to *the Committee of Council as the supreme educational authority*, without giving the heads of the Established Church so much as the trouble of expressing their opinions.

2. The appointment of *a staff of inspectors* for the exercise of their newly acquired powers, again *by the sole authority of the Committee of Council*, and without reference to the sanction or otherwise of any ecclesiastical authority.

3. The establishment of *a normal school for the training of masters under the sole authority and direction of the Committee of Council.*

It does not for a moment occur to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, that it is not competent for him, by his simple endorsement of the "opinions" of Mr. Kay Shuttleworth, to confer upon the Committee of Council an authority against which upon a former and very recent occasion the Legislature and the heads of the Church have recorded their most decided objections. As if the exercise of such a power on his part was in the strictest conformity to law and established usage, he assumes the fundamental points of his scheme as a basis for immediate action, the only things which remain to be considered being matters of detail, such as the choice of a site and other like arrangements.

Before we proceed to ascertain what the "requisite steps"

[2] The remaining part of this extract, from the words "The establishment of a normal school," &c., is the first document given in the Parliamentary return of August 1, 1849.

were, which the Committee of Council took upon the recommendation of the Home Secretary, it may be worth while to take a look at the "inclosed paper," the production of Mr. Kay Shuttleworth. The "paper" sets out with a few paragraphs of sententious abuse of the existing workhouse-schools—the generality of which are, we dare say, bad enough—by way of introduction to the proposition that, in order to remedy this state of things, "a sound practical education"—that is, education in accordance with the taste, the judgment, and the creed of Mr. Kay Shuttleworth,—is indispensable. He says:—

"To overlook this consequence of the preceding steps of legislation would be to betray a want of confidence in *those moral agencies which the authors of the Poor Law Amendment Act have been accustomed to plead as the true means of elevating the poor.*"—*Minutes*, pp. v. vi.

The phrase which we have marked in italics is remarkable, and inadvertently expressive of the principle which lies at the root of all the endeavours and aspirations of the Committee of Council on Education. It is not on religion, not on Christianity, much less on any definite form of Christianity, that "the authors of the Poor Law Amendment Act," who are also the progenitors of the Committee of Council on Education, rely for "elevating the poor." Their dependence is on certain "moral agencies," to be directed by the Committee of Council through inspectors, teachers, and pupil teachers, and a system of secular instruction, with a dash of "general religion" thrown in, as a sop to the prejudices of a people who have not yet cast off all their religious feelings, nor repudiated all their ecclesiastical traditions.

Mr. Kay Shuttleworth next takes notice of the fact, that, "in the estimates of the Poor Law Commissioners for the year 1846-7, 30,000*l.* was voted for the salaries of the schoolmasters of workhouses;" and, after indulging in a few conjectures as to what he "conceives" to have been "the general outline of Sir Robert Peel's plan for the application of this parliamentary grant," he proceeds to offer a few suggestions for the better carrying out of his own "conception" of another man's plan. The formation of *district* schools, as distinguished from *union* schools, involving the removal of the children from the workhouse altogether, is a favourite project of Mr. Kay Shuttleworth; and we are not prepared to say that we should not agree with him, if the children thus separated from all the demoralizing influences of their pauper condition, instead of being subjected to the "moral agencies" of what the Secretary of the Committee of Council calls a "sound practical education," were to be placed under the nurture and guardianship of their spiritual mother.

The establishment of district schools, however, does not appear

to be attainable for the present, owing to the opposition of the Boards of Guardians, of whom Mr. Kay Shuttleworth expresses a charitable hope that by-and-by they will "acquire a more enlightened view of their responsibilities and interests;" and, waiting this promised illumination, he is willing to content himself with the minor achievement of "introducing progressive improvements into the existing schools." The heads under which he classes his suggestions for this end are:—

"I. The adequacy of the salary of the schoolmasters and mistresses available from this grant.

"II. Whether any and what conditions may properly be required from the Boards of Guardians in consideration of the grant of the salary.

"III. The mode of appointment, and qualifications to be required.

"IV. The officers by whom the school is to be examined, and the nature of the inspection.

"V. The mode of dismissal."—*Minutes*, p. vii.

Under the first head he finds fault with the amount of the parliamentary grant. There are 600 unions, and at least 700 workhouse-schools in England and Wales. The grant of 30,000*l.*, therefore, gives an average of 45*l.* to each such school, apportioned by Mr. Kay Shuttleworth in the proportion of 30*l.* to the master and 15*l.* to the mistress. Instead of this he proposes that the master should receive 40*l.*, the mistress 25*l.*, making a total charge of 45,500*l.* The reader will observe, that although Mr. Shuttleworth contemplates the reduction of the number of schools by the establishment of district schools, he forms his estimate of the grant upon the supposition that all the existing schools shall be provided with efficient masters and mistresses. This, however, is the least remarkable feature in his calculations. On the plea that "persons trained with the hope of having charge of parochial schools" would not be induced to undertake the duties of schoolmasters in a workhouse, he deems it essential that there should be established, in connexion with some good and efficient school, like Norwood school, "a normal school for the training of masters for workhouse-schools, in which they should be prepared for their peculiar position, and in return for their training enter into engagements of service in workhouse-schools *for a certain period.*"

"If such an establishment provided fifty trained masters annually, and the average duration of their service in a workhouse (having a regard to all casualties) were twelve years, these establishments would, ere long, be supplied with a class of efficient masters."—*Minutes*, p. ix.

What is to become of the succession of masters trained at the

normal schools, supposing them, as, of course, the great majority of them would do, to outlive their period of twelve years' service, is not stated; it is not, however, difficult to guess. But of this more anon.

Under the second head, the conditions to be imposed on the guardians for the supply of such masters, there are many excellent regulations as to the schoolmaster's position in the workhouse, the general tendency of which, however, is to emancipate him from the control of the workhouse authorities, and to bring him more immediately under the control and superintendence of the Committee of Council on Education. One of those conditions deserves special notice, bearing, as it does, upon the remoter objects of the scheme, and illustrating, in a remarkable manner, the far-sightedness of Mr. Kay Shuttleworth; we allude to condition D, which makes it compulsory on the Board of Guardians to support, at the discretion of the Inspector of the Committee of Council, "one or more of the most proficient and skilful monitors as assistants to the master," to be apprenticed to him, and provided with a small stipend by the guardians. By this regulation, the Committee of Council will have it in their power to secure an unlimited extent of recruits for their normal school, and their staff of secular schoolmasters, without any difficulty as to funds; any workhouse-school being liable to become, upon the simple *dictum* of the Committee's Inspector, a nursery for the normal school.

Another remarkable feature in this paper of "opinions" is the religious qualification required for the different degrees of certificates to be given to the masters and mistresses, on examination by the inspector. These certificates are, in the first instance, to be of four kinds: certificates of "permission," of "probation," of "competency," and of "efficiency." Throughout there is a marked disproportion between the amount of secular and religious knowledge required of the teacher. The lowest certificate, which only tolerates the teacher *ad interim* till his (or her) place can be supplied by a better, unless he improve himself to the satisfaction of the inspector at the next year's examination, requires that he should read fluently, write correctly for dictation, and be perfect in the first four rules of arithmetic; but in point of religious knowledge it will suffice that he should be able to "answer *verbally* a few simple questions respecting *the life of our Saviour*." The second certificate, which requires ability to write an abstract of a narrative from memory, in a neat hand and correctly; to work questions in the four simple and compound rules of arithmetic, and to prove his skill in the examination of a class in a reading-lesson, makes, under the head of religion, no higher demand than "to

answer correctly *in writing* a few simple questions on the life of our Saviour *and his disciples*." The third certificate carries secular proficiency as far as the ability "to describe in writing the organization of his school, explaining the methods of instruction and discipline which he employs, and the course of instruction communicated by him;" to work any question in "the arithmetic of whole numbers, including simple interest;" to "parse and explain the construction of English prose narrative;" to answer questions in "geography, especially that of the United Kingdom and the English colonies;" to "conduct a class, in the presence of the inspector, in such lessons as might be required;" but in point of religious knowledge it rests content with the ability to reply to "a series of questions on *the Scripture narrative* and *the geography of Palestine*." The highest certificate, that of efficiency, requires evidence of "sound attainments" in "English grammar, composition, etymology, decimal arithmetic, geography, the outlines of English history, and the history and art of organizing and managing a school," and, as concerning religion, in "*Biblical knowledge*," with a special mention of "*Palestine*," under the head of *geography*. No trace whatever appears, on the face of the regulations, of any religious doctrine; creeds and catechisms are wholly out of the question; there is no requirement of "religious" knowledge which Tom Paine might not have abundantly satisfied, no guarantee whatever that the masters formed under the operation of this system shall not be, but rather a strong probability that they will be, a set of Socinians, rationalists, and infidels, attached to no particular religion, belief, or communion, to whom the Bible will be nothing more than a repository of historical and geographical knowledge, the notes to Charles Knight's "Pictorial Bible" containing the "sum" of their "theology."

Under the fourth head of "suggestions," it is proposed that the whole country should be divided, for the purposes of this scheme, into four districts of inspection,—four educational provinces,—with an inspector to each; the metropolitan one being smaller than the rest, in order to leave the inspector time for visiting the normal school, and performing other special services. The qualifications of these functionaries are not "suggested;" they are in the breast of the Committee of Council and of their Secretary: and it is fair to suppose that they would be chosen without reference to their creed, or rather with reference to their having no creed. Clergymen would be wholly out of the question—except, perhaps, such as, having sought relief, under Mr. Bouverie's bill, from the trouble and snare of subscription, might relapse, like Mr. Marshall, the Popish inspector, into the simple condition of "esquires."

The fifth head, which treats of the dismissal of schoolmasters, is curious chiefly as a specimen of the instinctive propensity of the writer's mind to grasp power by indirect and tortuous methods. He sets out with the broad proposition, that the dismissal of schoolmasters should be "vested in the Poor Law Commissioners." But this concession of power to the Commissioners is considerably modified by what follows:—

"*If* the examination of workhouse-schools, and of candidates for these offices, *were* confided to the Inspectors of Schools, the *necessary* communication with the Poor Law Commissioners would be made *through the office of the Committee of Council on Education;* and, with respect to the appointment and dismissal of schoolmasters, the Poor-Law Commissioners would *receive the Reports of the Committee of Council on Education*, who would award the certificates by which the salaries would be determined.

"*All communications to the Inspectors of Schools* from the Poor Law Commissioners would *necessarily* pass *through the office of the Committee of Council on Education.*

"The schoolmaster should be amenable, as a part of the staff of the workhouse, in all respects, to the direct interference of the Poor-Law Commissioners; but, *in what related to school discipline and management*, the Commissioners would *seek information from the Committee of Council on Education.*"—*Minutes*, pp. xiii. xiv.

Thus far Mr. Kay Shuttleworth, and his "paper" of "opinions" and "suggestions." We now return to the proceedings of the Committee of Council on Education, by which these airy nothings have been clothed with substance and reality. They consist of two sets of minutes, dated, respectively, 21st December, 1846, and 18th December, 1847, in which the "paper" of Mr. Kay Shuttleworth is distinctly recognized, but in such terms as do not commit their Lordships to its contents, while, at the same time, the adoption of the suggestions made in it is implied throughout. The Minutes of December 21st, 1846, appear in the General Minutes of the Committee for 1846, previously published, where they seem to have passed muster in the crowd, and to have attracted no particular notice. They consist of two distinct Minutes; the first of which, omitted, for some unaccountable reason, from the volume just published, has reference to the normal school; the other, which is inserted in the recent volume, is to the following effect:—

"The Lord President brought under the consideration of their lordships a letter received from the Secretary of State for the Home Department, dated 18 November, 1846[3], calling their attention to the

[3] The letter referred to above, p. 111.

fact that 15,000*l.* were granted in the late Session of Parliament towards defraying the expense of salaries of masters and mistresses of pauper schools, and to the importance of rendering grants for this purpose in future years conducive to the increased efficiency of such schools.

"The Lord President also communicated to their lordships a paper, prepared at the request of Sir George Grey, on the administration of these grants.

"From these documents it appeared, that there were upwards of 700 workhouse-schools, and that little progress had hitherto been made in the establishment of schools of industry for districts of unions, owing to the limitation of the radius of such districts in the Act of Parliament authorizing their creation, and also to the limitation of the expense for which the rate-payers under this Act might be rated towards the erection of the requisite buildings. Their lordships were of opinion, that it was expedient to employ inspectors for the examination of workhouse-schools, in order that by their suggestions to the guardians, and upon their reports, measures might be adopted in the administration of these grants to procure the improvement of these schools.

"*Resolved*,—That it is desirable to train the pauper children now in workhouses in habits of industry.

"That with this view, and for the purpose of improving workhouse-schools, four inspectors be appointed, with authority to examine the condition of schools for the education of pauper children, and to ascertain the character and qualifications of the persons employed as schoolmasters and mistresses, in order that unfit and incompetent persons may no longer be employed in that capacity, and that measures may be taken for awarding salaries according to the qualifications of the masters or mistresses, and the extent of the duties they have to perform.

"That instructions be prepared for the guidance of such inspectors." —*Minutes*, pp. xv. xvi.

In addition to this Minute, there appears to have been another, which is not given in the volume before us; for a Minute of December 18th, 1847, refers to a recommendation made to Her Majesty by the Committee of Council, for the appointment of *five* [the Minute of 21st December, 1846, mentions only *four*] inspectors, four of whom were, as it appears from the same Minute, in operation in the latter part of the year 1847. Of the appointment of these inspectors, of their duties, salaries, &c. &c., there is no account. That the inspectors, five in number, were in office and in full work, is clear from a variety of documents; but the history of their introduction to their duties is wholly wanting. A letter, containing instructions to Her Majesty's inspectors of schools of parochial unions in England and Wales, does, indeed, appear in the collection; but that bears date of February 5th, 1848; whereas in December, 1847, four of the inspectors had been already at work "for some months." The

Minute of December 18th, 1847, seems to account for this by stating that their Lordships conceived it expedient to permit the organization of the new Commission of the Poor Laws ere they issued instructions to Her Majesty's inspectors: this, however, is a lame excuse, for it is manifestly impossible that the inspectors could have been appointed and set to work without instructions of some sort; and we are, therefore, led to the conclusion, either that written instructions were given to them, which, for some reason or other, are suppressed in the collection now printed, or, that this new machinery in the hands of the Committee of Council was brought into operation under the mere verbal instructions of the Secretary of the Committee of Council, who is unquestionably the most irresponsible officer in the whole extent of Her Majesty's dominions.

Be this as it may, the Minute of the Committee of Council, dated 18th December, 1847, together with the letter of instructions of February 5th, 1848, and the "Extracts" included in the return, from "Supplementary Letters of Instructions[4]," furnish evidence of the extent to which, as far back as 1847, and wholly unnoticed and unsuspected, a system of State education has been in force throughout the country. From these documents it appears, that the five inspectors[5] have been at work

[4] One of the most grievous features of the arbitrary and unconstitutional conduct of the Committee of Council is the fragmentary and capricious manner in which information as to their proceedings and schemes is conveyed to Parliament and the public. Thus, some of the Minutes of 1846 are the latest in the collection published in 1848; now, in 1849, we are permitted to know—in extract at least—the proceedings of the Committee to the close of 1847; while the documents of a much later date (some reaching down to June 1849), which could not be kept from publicity, having been put into official circulation, indicate a further expansion of the plans of the Committee, the true character of which will not be fully disclosed till after a further lapse of time, when the mischief done shall be beyond recall. The measures resorted to with regard to the Management Clauses, which were in "unobtrusive" operation for years before they came fairly under public notice, are by no means a solitary instance, but a mere exemplification of the habitual tactics of the Committee of Council, whose evident aim and endeavour is to foist upon the country by surreptitious methods a system of education antagonistic to the Church, and subversive of all true religion.

[5] The five Inspectors are: 1. E. Carleton Tufnell, Esq., for the "Metropolitan District," comprising the Counties of Middlesex, Kent, Surrey, Sussex, and parts of Essex, Hertfordshire, Berkshire, and Buckinghamshire;—2. Joshua Ruddock, Esq., for the "Southern District," comprising the Counties of Cornwall, Devon, Dorset, Hants, Oxford, Somerset, and Wilts, a portion of Berkshire and Buckinghamshire;—3. H. G. Bowyer, Esq., for the "Eastern and Midland Districts," comprising the Counties of Lincoln, Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridge, Huntingdon, Nottingham, Leicester, Northampton, Bedford, Warwick, and Stafford, and a portion of Essex and Hertfordshire;—4. T. B. Browne, Esq., for the Northern Districts, comprising the Counties of Northumberland, Cumberland, Durham, Westmoreland, York, Lancaster, Chester, and Derby;—5. Jelinger C. Symons, Esq., B.A., Barrister at Law, for Wales, and the Counties of Worcester, Hereford, Salop, Monmouth, and the chief part of Gloucestershire. This division of the country into "Districts" is very nearly coincident with that adopted by the intruded popish epis-

from the latter part of 1847, visiting every union school in the United Kingdom, and placing every master and mistress after examination under the immediate control of the Committee of Council. According to the Minute of 18th December, 1847, the salaries of all the teachers employed under the Poor Law Commissioners, which were provisionally suffered to continue upon the old scale, are for the present year (1849) dependent on the certificates obtained by them at the examination of 1848, these certificates themselves being *determined by the Committee of Council on Education*, upon the "Report and Examination Papers submitted by Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools." The same Minute provides "that one-half the stipends of pupil-teachers (under the Minutes of August and December, 1846), and the entire gratuities to the teacher for the successful education of apprentices, be granted to teachers of workhouse-schools holding certificates of competency or efficiency, on condition that the stipend of the pupil-teacher be *reserved by the Committee of Council on Education*, to form a fund which shall be given to him on his leaving the workhouse, if he successfully complete his apprenticeship, *in order to provide for his further education in any training school which he may enter with their Lordships' approbation.*"

The "Letters of Instructions" to the inspectors have reference chiefly to the regulations contemplated by the Committee for the classification of the masters and mistresses, with reference to their competency and consequent remuneration; to the views entertained at the Council Office with regard to the introduction of the industrial element into pauper schools; and to certain limitations of the power of the inspectors, which the excessive zeal of these functionaries appears to have called forth, by exciting the jealousy of the guardians and other authorities connected with the Poor Laws. There is one passage, however, on the subject of the religious instruction contemplated in union schools, to which it is desirable that attention should be called. The passage is as follows:—

"The letter of the Poor Law Commissioners to the Chaplain of the Norwood School of Industry, conveying their view of the mode in which his spiritual instructions might most effectually promote the education of such children, deserves your attentive perusal.

"Before this letter was issued, it was submitted to the Bishops of London and Winchester, and approved by them; it may therefore be

copate, and, superseding the old established divisions, both civil and ecclesiastical, is itself a curious feature of the scheme, reminding one involuntarily of the recorded opinion of Mr. J. Kay, that Protestantism will not do for the masses, that Popery is the thing for them.

regarded as having authority, and the experience of several years now confirms the wisdom of its suggestions. If this letter be not in the hands of the chaplains of the Unions which you visit, it may be well to introduce it to their consideration."—*Minutes*, p. xxi.

No copy of the letter here referred to is given in the volume, nor any clue to the circumstances under which the approbation of the two prelates named by Mr. Shuttleworth may have been obtained; but, remembering the facility with which that gentleman has been wont to procure the highest sanction for his plans, we feel some curiosity, we confess, to know what these instructions are, which, we are told, "may be regarded as having authority." As a general rule, it appears that the office of the Poor Law Chaplains in superintending the religious instruction of the children is recognized,—a recognition which would be more satisfactory if the position of these functionaries were less precarious and dependent, and if there were any trace in the Papers before us that it is intended to commit to them any thing beyond a merely nominal share of the superintendence of the schools, and, in the event of district schools being formed, to appoint Chaplains as superintendents over them. As it is, the Chaplain plays in these documents an exceedingly insignificant and almost supernumerary part, and he will not, under the arrangements here contemplated, be in a position to counteract the infection of a purely secular tone of mind which the masters and mistresses trained under the auspices of the Committee of Council are likely to import into the Parochial Union Schools.

From the instructions given to the inspectors, and still more from their reports, it is evident that in the teaching of the schools under the direction of the Committee of Council religion is intended to be made as little prominent as we have already seen that it is in the examination of the teachers. From this observation we must, however, except the report of Mr. Browne, who has placed sentiments on record in relation to this point which do him great credit, but which, we fear, ill accord with the general spirit of the system under which he is employed.

"Defective," he says, "as the education of the poor has hitherto been in this country, religious instruction has clearly been the point least neglected, and it is probable that to the deeper influence and more extensive prevalence of religious principles here, more than to any other single cause, we owe our freedom from the convulsions which have recently agitated the Continent of Europe. No system of general education, I am persuaded, of which the Scriptures are not made the basis, can be expected to accomplish moral, nor, perhaps, even intellectual results of importance. As false views of human nature seem inseparably associated with infidelity, which regards man at one

time as a monster of selfishness, and at another as destined to reach a vague and visionary perfection by his own unassisted efforts, and thus consigns its followers either to despair of themselves and their species, or urges them upon impracticabilities,—so the Bible is not only the solitary record of religious truth in existence, but appears also to have the power of teaching common sense beyond all other books. It enables us to estimate ourselves rightly, by setting before us, with a singular healthiness of tone, and a constant reference to duty, the world as it is, men as they are: it acts upon the understanding through the heart and the conscience; it is light, and growth is a consequence of light.

"But as the Bible not only furnishes us with rules and principles of conduct, not only elevates and purifies the mind and feelings, but reveals to us the mystery of our redemption and 'the words of everlasting life,' no ordinary responsibility must rest upon those who would attempt in any degree to diminish its influence, much more to exclude it from mixed schools, such as those in workhouses, where children of all religious persuasions may meet, on the plea that it is differently interpreted by different sects. It may be that these alleged differences of interpretation among Protestants are greatly exaggerated. It may be added, with more confidence, that such points do not, or need not, arise in the study of those passages of Scripture which are best adapted to the comprehension of children, and that therefore the assumed difficulty can hardly be said to exist. And here I am enabled to speak from personal experience, as not only many children in the schools I have inspected belong to various denominations, but teachers also; and it is very probable that this state of things may continue, if ordinary discretion is exercised, without discord, and without compromise of religious truth.

"The advocates of a merely secular education will, I am aware, profess that they do not intend to deprive children of religious instruction, but maintain that it should be given to the children of each denomination apart, and out of the school, by their respective ministers. In the case of Roman Catholic children this may be unavoidable; but such an arrangement can hardly fail to have a bad effect on the mind of the child. He will naturally attach most importance to that kind of knowledge which obtains for him distinction among his fellows, and if the Bible is excluded from his school, it will probably sink in his estimation. Many educated men may recollect instances of the display of a similar feeling in the course of their own experience. There is, further, little security that such instruction in private will be effectually given, for whatever is not done openly is seldom done well.

"A merely secular education is the most prodigious of experiments; and they who maintain a proposition so strange and extravagant, as that a child will walk in the right way without right principles to guide him, or with such principles only as he may himself select, are bound to specify instances, and those neither few nor ambiguous, where their scheme has been tried and prospered. All who have any definite

religious opinions must feel the importance and desire the acceptance of what they sincerely believe to be true.

"To avoid unfair attempts at proselyting, which would be an abuse of the workhouse, and at the same time to avoid all compromise of religious truth, seems difficult; but it is a difficulty to be overcome, not by art or study, but by a simple and honest mind, and which can hardly indeed be overcome otherwise. If the Bible is read in a cavilling spirit, or to justify preconceived opinions, it may become the germ of controversies innumerable: it should be read with a sincere desire to ascertain its real sense; but all compromise produces indifference to truth, and destroys the teacher's power over the consciences of children.

"Believing, then, that sound Scriptural principles form the only real security for the future good conduct and happiness of every child, I have always made religious instruction the most important point in the examination of schools. At the same time, I can fully subscribe, from my own experience, to the opinion of Inspectors generally, 'that there is most religious knowledge in those schools where the reading of the Scriptures is united in a just proportion with secular instruction,' and that 'no ordinary sacrifice is made of the veneration due to the word of God, when it is constantly applied to a secular use.'"—*Minutes*, pp. 145—147.

With these observations, as far as they are opposed to a merely secular education, we, of course, fully accord; but we apprehend considerable difficulty in their practical application, from the proposed exclusion of all distinctive doctrines, the instruction being confined to the vague generalities of what are called "sound scriptural principles,"—a phrase which practically means nothing at all, where it is left to chance what shall be considered "sound scriptural principles," and where probably any distinctive religious dogma, however scriptural, would be objected to as "sectarian." Under such circumstances, and with teachers whose religious qualifications are restricted to "sound biblical knowledge," there is reason to fear that the experiment of teaching a "general religion" will not be much more successful in English union schools than it appears to have been in Germany, according to two anecdotes told by Mr. Browne, which we transcribe in this place, as they accurately embody the sort of thing which we imagine will result from the system pursued by the Committee of Council.

"I was present at an examination in a German mixed school, consisting of Protestant and Roman Catholic children. With the view, I suppose, of securing impartiality, the schoolmaster was a Roman Catholic, and the schoolmistress a Protestant. The schoolmaster examined a class on the subject of the marriage at Cana. He drew the attention of the children to the facts, that the rain which fell in vineyards was imbibed by the alimentary vessels of the vine through the roots and the leaves; that it contributed to the growth and juice

of the grapes, which, when ripened by the heat of the sun, were gathered, pressed out, and, after fermentation, became wine. He thus gave a good physical lesson; but its effect on the minds of the children must surely have been to lead them to confound a miracle with the ordinary operations of nature.

"He probably felt himself precluded from the subject of religion as dangerous ground, and was therefore compelled to exercise his ingenuity in secularizing Scripture.

"In another German school, where I heard the history of Ananias and Sapphira read, and where both the inspector, a Protestant clergyman, and the schoolmaster were present, the moral and religious points were very imperfectly elicited. The inspector and the teacher alternately harangued the boys instead of questioning them; and, of the few questions asked, some were trivial and irrelevant, as, 'Into how many languages has the Bible been translated?'"—*Minutes*, pp. 146, 147.

The fears which upon this account we cannot help entertaining, are confirmed by certain indications which occasionally peep out in the inspectors' reports, and even in the report of Mr. Browne himself, of a tendency to curtail the exercise of reading the Bible in the schools, and to substitute for it the reading of books of secular information. We feel as strong an objection as any one to the desecration of the Bible as a mere reading-book; but we object still more strongly to the neglect of the Bible, under pretence of veneration for it, in schools in which the opportunities of the children to be taught reading are exceedingly limited. That the Bible should not be made a spelling-book, is agreed on all hands; but, when children have attained a sufficient proficiency in the rudiments of the art of reading to enable them to read connected sentences, and the reading of a portion of Holy Scripture daily occupies as much of their time as they can give to the exercise of reading, we contend that no secular book should be permitted to supplant the Bible. It is far better that a child should leave school, well versed in the Bible, though possibly backward in the art of reading in other books, than that he should have gained a certain facility of reading in secular books, at the expense of his knowledge of the Bible. We are the more urgent on this point, because it appears, from the reports of the inspectors, that their interference in the system of the workhouse-schools has had a general tendency to diminish the reading of the Bible, and to introduce books of miscellaneous contents in its place; and one of them, Mr. Bowyer, has had the candour to record the effect of this proceeding. Having made two tours of inspection through his district, and visited the same schools at the distance of six months, he gives the following tabular statement of the result of the alterations introduced in compliance with his directions.

Condition of Workhouse Education at the time of my First Tour, extending from October 14, 1847, *to May* 10, 1848[6].

	Boys.	Proportion of Boys under each Head to the Total Number.	Girls and Infants.	Proportion of Girls and Infants under each Head to the Total Number.
PRESENT	4307	. .	4790	. .
Number of Children reading the Scriptures with ease	1440	1 in 2·98	1362	1 in 3·49
Ditto Books of General Information with ease	745	1 in 5·78	596	1 in 8·03
Number of Children Writing on Paper from Copies	1761	1 in 2·44	1247	1 in 3·84
Ditto on Slates from Dictation and Memory	482	1 in 8·93	311	1 in 15·40
Number of Children in Arithmetic—				
Addition	445	1 in 9·67	475	1 in 10·08
Three Simple Rules	653	1 in 6·59	517	1 in 9·26
Compound Rules and Reduction .	524	1 in 8·21	302	1 in 15·86
Proportion and Practice . . .	172	1 in 25·04	16	1 in 299·37
Geography	256	1 in 16·82	57	1 in 84·03
Grammar	60	1 in 71·78	13	1 in 368·46
History of England	61	1 in 70·60	30	1 in 159·66

Condition of Workhouse Education at my Second Tour, extending from May 10, 1848, *to November* 15 *in the same Year.*

PRESENT	3663	. .	3927	. .
Number of Children reading the Scriptures with ease	1226	1 in 2·98	1005	1 in 3·92
Ditto Books of General Information with ease	801	1 in 4·57	606	1 in 6·51
Number of Children Writing on Paper from Copies	1716	1 in 2·13	1296	1 in 3·03
Dittto on Slates from Dictation and Memory	332	1 in 11·02	204	1 in 19·25
Number of Children in Arithmetic—				
Addition	393	1 in 9·32	431	1 in 9·10
Three Simple Rules	715	1 in 5·12	601	1 in 6·51
Compound Rules and Reduction .	654	1 in 5·60	330	1 in 11·90
Proportion and Practice . . .	176	1 in 20·81	32	1 in 122·71
Geography	443	1 in 8·26	238	1 in 16·55
Grammar	132	1 in 27·75	56	1 in 70·12
History of England	110	1 in 33·3	44	1 in 89·22

[6] Minutes, p. 74.

From this table it appears that, while in almost every branch of instruction a marked improvement had taken place, the facility of reading the Holy Scriptures had remained stationary among the boys, and actually retrograded among the girls; whereas it ought to have improved, at the very least, in the same ratio in which the pupils generally advanced in knowledge and intelligence.

This consideration becomes still more weighty when the class of books is taken into account which has at the suggestion of the inspectors been introduced into these schools. Among them, we regret to find that the lesson-books of the Irish National Education Board occupy a conspicuous place, which is but another specimen of the insidious system which is at work by the agency of the Committee of Council, and which aims distinctly at supplanting the National Church as the teacher of the rising generation, by a system of State instruction of an essentially secular and—as far as it professes any religion—latitudinarian character. We are, therefore, far from displeased to find from the reports that the good sense of the guardians offers considerable obstruction to the introduction of so much secular knowledge into the schools, and that the process of enlightening these functionaries as to what constitutes "sound practical education" is not quite as rapid and successful as Mr. Kay Shuttleworth appears to have anticipated.

Before we take leave of the inspectors' labours, we must not omit to notice two topics which are much dwelt upon, and which, on account of their evident importance, deserve the most careful consideration. One is a new theory, originating, we presume, in that famous nursery of educational theories, the Council Office, which contemplates no less an innovation in the education of our pauper children than the association of the two sexes in the school during a certain portion of the day. It is scarcely worth while to recapitulate, much less to refute, the arguments adduced in support of this un-English proposal. We only mention it, as one of the dangers which are threatening the education of our people under the auspices of the Committee of Council, whose educational vagaries, if not checked, will terminate in rationalism and socialism as their legitimate results. The other point to which we are desirous of directing attention is one on which we are happy to be able to express our concurrence in the plans contemplated by the Committee of Council, viz. the connexion of industrial, and especially of agricultural pursuits, with pauper schools. That this would be an immense improvement cannot for a moment be doubted, even without the conclusive evidence supplied from various quarters as to the general inability

of pauper children to get their livelihood by honest means after leaving the workhouse-school. As the case stands at present, the workhouse-schools are little better than seminaries for young criminals, who, after burdening the country with the cost of their so-called education, entail upon it the further expense of their repeated capture, imprisonment, and eventual transportation, to say nothing of the injury inflicted by them upon society while they are at large. The reports of Mr. Bowyer and Mr. Symons are particularly full on this subject, and the latter throws out a suggestion which has struck us as being exceedingly valuable. He says:—

"I am of opinion that it would be advisable to have a school for each county, and for each division of the larger counties. In this case the maximum distance of the district school from each of the workhouses to which it belonged would be from 15 to 20 miles (exceptional cases excepted). This would enable a single horse to go and return from the district school to any of the workhouses during a day. I suggest that a horse be kept for this express purpose. It would be a very trifling item in the expenditure of a farm school, and it would give a constant and easy means of transit for the children who might require removal to and fro. It should be the rule to send all children to the district school as soon as they enter the workhouse, without reference to the probable period of their stay. By such means only shall we obtain the full measure of the benefit we justly expect from district schools. The inconvenience of sending the children frequently backwards and forwards, even if it occurred as often as the objectors imagine, would be nothing compared to the evil of leaving them in the workhouses.

"Such an arrangement, moreover, would entirely supersede the necessity of retaining any school teachers whatever in the workhouses."—*Minutes*, p. 25.

It is quite refreshing once more to hear mention made of the county as a recognised subdivision of the kingdom. Why, indeed, should not every county have its agricultural and industrial schools—or schools, if one be found insufficient—for the instruction and education of its pauper children? And why should not that school be committed to the charge of the proper civil and ecclesiastical authorities of the county? What need is there of a Committee of Council, with its secretary and inspectors? why not place the school under the control of the lord-lieutenant and the magistracy of the county, with the bishop for its visitor, the master being supplied from a diocesan training school, or, if preferred, from a central normal school for the education of industrial and agricultural teachers, under the auspices of the National Church? With such a provision for the training of the children in sound principles of religion and loyalty, there might

be hope of the pauper population of our land being retrieved from the state of degradation into which it has fallen.

Unfortunately there is not much hope that Mr. Symons' suggestion, in the enlarged form in which we have reproduced it, will find favour at the Council Office; still the idea is valuable, and should not be lost sight of. Better times may come, and with these, better measures, when a practical hint of this kind may come into use. In the mean time it behoves us to keep a watchful eye upon the movements of those anti-national and anti-religious theories of education that are now in the ascendant; and, with this view, we resume our examination of the evidence to be gathered from the documents on pauper education, which are lying before us.

In order to estimate the importance of the movement made, or rather the march stolen, by the Committee of Council in this matter, it is desirable to ascertain as far as possible the extent and working of this branch of national education; for which purpose different elements must be taken into account. One of them, and a very striking one, is the greater facility and success with which the education of children entirely under the control of their teachers is conducted, as illustrated by the following table, inserted in Mr. Bowyer's report, which is founded upon the result of his own observations, compared with those of the Rev. H. Moseley, in his Report of the National Schools of the Midland district, being nearly coincident with the district under Mr. Bowyer's inspection[7]:—

Total Number in the Schools.	National School Children.	Workhouse Children.
Number in the Schools	10,042	7,590
Reading the Scriptures with ease	1 in 7·31	1 in 3·41
Writing on paper . . .	1 in 4·88	1 in 2·52
In the 4 Simple Rules .	1 in 3·71	1 in 3·55
In the Compound Rules .	1 in 11·78	1 in 7·73
In Proportion and upwards	1 in 43·66	1 in 32·80
In Grammar	1 in 10·77	1 in 40·47
In Etymology	1 in 38·18	1 in 59·82
In History of England .	1 in 10·66	1 in 49·41
In Geography	1 in 6·34	1 in 11·17

With the exception of the last four branches of education, which are generally neglected in workhouse education, there is a

[7] Minutes, p. 77.

remarkable balance in favour of the latter, even in its present indifferent state. Those who are practically acquainted with the drawbacks upon the progress of children at parochial schools, arising from irregularity of attendance, and other causes which residence in the workhouse at once cuts off, will not feel surprised at this result; and we may infer, from the contrast which the two kinds of schools exhibit even now, how great would be the superiority of schools in which the children of the poor are lodged and boarded, if they were conducted by masters and mistresses equal in ability to the generality of national school teachers. At the same time it must be borne in mind, that in proportion as schools of the latter class are more powerful than the ordinary national schools, in the same manner does it become a question of the utmost consequence, what sort of education is imparted in them, whether sound and religious, or unsound and latitudinarian, that is, practically irreligious.

Another element for ascertaining the importance of pauper education, as a branch of the general education of the people, is the number of children which are likely to come under the operation of the former. From the reports of the inspectors we learn, that the workhouse-schools inspected by them—and it is evident that they have not yet completed their survey of the country—contain an average of 50,000 scholars. Admitting this to be the whole number of children throughout the country lodged in workhouses, even that would amount to about one-twentieth of the children under instruction in the day schools of the Church. But there are passages in the reports which lead to a suspicion that the Committee of Council intend, by their scheme of pauper education, to get a much larger portion of the children of the lower classes within their grasp. The number of 50,000, above mentioned, includes only the children of in-door paupers. But inquiries have been set on foot to ascertain the number of out-door pauper children; and the object with which this has been done will be seen by the following extract from Mr. Symons' report. After pointing out the restrictions which impeded the establishment of district pauper schools, under the statute 7 and 8 Victoria, c. 101, Mr. Symons thus proceeds:—

"These limits have been since removed by the 10 and 11 Vict. c. 82, which enables the Poor Law Commissioners to form district schools, wherever 'the major part of the Guardians of the several Unions, and parishes not in union, proposed to be combined, shall previously thereto consent *in writing* to such combination.'

"This recent Act has unlocked the wise provisions of 7 and 8 Vict. c. 101, which I will take the liberty of recapitulating, as they are all-important to the due consideration of the subject.

"Section 40 enacts—

"'That it shall be lawful for the said Commissioners, as and when they may see fit, by order under their hands and seal, to combine Unions, or parishes not in union, or such parishes and Unions, into school districts, for the management of any class or classes of infant poor not above the age of sixteen years, being chargeable to any such parish or Union, who are orphans, or are deserted by their parents, or whose parents or surviving parent or guardians are consenting to the placing of such children in the school of such district.'

"I think it is clearly the intent of this clause that it shall be competent to the Boards of Guardians to send *all pauper children* to the district school falling within the above conditions, so long as they are anywise chargeable to their respective parishes or Unions. The words 'any class or classes' appear to me expressly to include the children of out-door paupers, as well as all children within the workhouse, of a fit age to be removed from their mothers, and whose parents or guardians do not object to such removal. These are very important powers, which must materially enhance the value and extend the usefulness of this salutary Act of Parliament.

"Perhaps there are no children in the kingdom whom it is more essential to rescue from the mismanagement of their parents, and the bad example of their families and companions, than the children of out-door paupers,—a class usually characterized by habits and vices disastrous to the morals of young persons, exposed to the contamination of their influence and society. I deem it therefore as essential, if not more so, to give such children the benefits of the moral and industrial discipline of a district school, as to afford it to the children now subjected to the contagion and confinement of a workhouse.

"My Lords will observe, from the table inserted in the Appendix, that I have endeavoured to procure returns of the number of these out-door children, and the proportion they bear to the in-door children. It appears that of the whole number no less than 88 per cent. are out-door children. This gives an ample supply for moderately sized district schools, even in districts which are not populous."—*Minutes*, pp. 253, 254.

Now, if we apply this proportion to the number of in-door pauper children before mentioned, viz. 50,000, it appears that there are about 370,000 children of out-door paupers throughout the country, which the present measure of the Committee of Council contemplates; making in all upwards of 400,000 children to be placed entirely under the control of the Committee of Council, its inspectors and teachers. This raises the question into one of first-rate national importance; for it amounts to no less than this, whether it be desirable for the well-being of this country, that an intellectual area, equal to nearly one-half of that occupied by the National Church, should be surrendered to the secular and secularizing influence of the Committee of Council,

being withdrawn for this purpose from the influence of the National Clergy, under whose superintendence these children at present fall, and to whose cures they belong. But this is not the whole extent of the projected encroachment. Mr. Symons in his report goes on to say:—

"I may perhaps be allowed to suggest that, in cases where the parents of a large family are struggling creditably against adverse circumstances, and are compelled to apply for temporary relief, it may often effectually aid them, and prevent their lapsing into a state of entire pauperism, to admit one or two of their children into the district school; this, with the consent of the Poor Law Commissioners, would be perfectly practicable. I have, however, felt it right to abstain from encouraging the notion that these district schools will be open to the admission of the children of parents nowise chargeable to parish relief; for the present law does not warrant it, however beneficial it may hereafter become. Such a measure has been often suggested to me."—*Min.* p. 254.

It is easy to see what an opening there is here for the still further extension of the secular education scheme of 1839, now revived in connexion with the pauper education of the country; and what a powerful effect in alienating the affections of the great mass of the people from the National Church, and the faith of their fathers, would be produced, in one or two generations, by the education of half, perhaps more than half, the children of the poor, in separation from her ordinances and in total ignorance of her doctrines, with no more of religious knowledge than the Socinian has in common with the Churchman. Nor will the vastness and subtlety of this far-seeing scheme astonish those who have watched the proceedings of the Committee of Council from their origin, and the various attempts—not forgetting the Factories Education Bill—made with a view to break in pieces, if possible, that great rock of offence to the latitudinarian faction in the State, sound Church teaching throughout the land.

One more link, however, is still wanting to complete the evidence of the extent of this scheme; it is that to which we adverted at the outset of our article, viz. the Normal School at Kneller Hall. The history of this establishment is left in convenient obscurity even by the present publication of the Committee of Council, and the Parliamentary return of the 1st of August, 1849; and it is only by circumstantial evidence that the deficiency of information can be supplied. The volume cited at the head of this article contains not one word of explanation on the subject. There is only in the "paper" prepared by Mr. Kay Shuttleworth, at the request of Sir George Grey, the suggestion of such an establishment, which might provide fifty trained masters annually. In the reports of the inspectors,

"Kneller Hall" is once or twice mentioned by name; and at other times the normal school is alluded to, but without any further indication of its nature and extent beyond Mr. Bowyer's observation,—the most circumstantial mention of the "Hall" anywhere in the volume,—that "the most important of those measures (of the Committee of Council for pauper education) are, the establishment, at Kneller Hall, of a training school for workhouse-schoolmasters, and the introduction of pupil-teachers into workhouse-schools." Indeed, so little is said about this institution in the volume before us, that its very existence might escape the reader's attention but for a flaming lithograph of its magnificent frontage opposite the title-page, and four ground-plans of its different stories at the end of the book. The Parliamentary return of the 1st of August, however, contains a Minute on the subject, dated the 20th of December, 1846, which is also printed among the Minutes of the Committee of Council of 1846, to the following effect:—

"*Normal Schools for Training Masters for Workhouse-Schools, and for Penal Schools.*

"Their lordships had further under their consideration the measures required to carry into execution the suggestions of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, for the establishment of normal and model schools for the training of masters of schools for pauper and for criminal children.

"*Resolved*—That a building be erected for the normal school, providing accommodation for a principal, vice-principal, two masters, and for 100 candidate teachers.

"That it be referred to the Lord President and Secretary of the State for the Home Department, to cause plans to be prepared for this purpose.

"That, as two years must elapse before this building can be ready for occupation, premises be in the mean time procured, in which the normal school may be temporarily conducted; and that these premises be situated, if possible, near some workhouse or other school, which may serve as a practising school during the interval.

"That, in connexion with the normal school, a model school of industry be erected for the pauper children of some of the London unions, who may be received into this school, either on contract by a steward with the unions, or by letting the building to a district of unions for the reception of children, under the direction of a board of management, according to the provisions of the 7 and 8 Vict. c. 101.

"That, in connexion with this normal school, but distinct and separate from the school for pauper children, a school be erected for criminal children, and that plans of buildings for the school of industry for pauper children, and for this separate penal school, be prepared and submitted to the Secretary of State for the Home Department.

"That it be referred to the Lord President and Secretary of State for the Home Department, to cause regulations to be prepared for the management of the normal school, and of the practising schools as connected with it, as well as for the pauper school of industry and the penal school.

"That an area of at least 10 acres is desirable for the normal school, 10 acres for the pauper school, and 10 for the penal school, in order that training in gardening, and the management of a cottage farm, may be successfully pursued.

"That the following general estimate of outlay on the buildings, and of annual expenditure, be approved:—

Buildings.

	£.
The buildings of the normal school . . .	10,000
The buildings of the pauper school . . .	5,000
The buildings of the penal school . . .	5,000
Annual charge of normal school . . .	3,500

"That it be referred to the Lord President and Secretary of State for the Home Department to direct the selection of the buildings required for the temporary management of the normal school, and to determine the number of officers which may be required during the gradual growth of the establishment.

"That the qualifications of the candidates for the offices of teachers in these schools be subjected to a careful examination, under the direction of the Lord President; and that the several schools be, from time to time, inspected by Her Majesty's Inspectors, and a report thereon submitted to the Committee of Council, and transmitted by their lordships to the Secretary of State for the Home Department."—*Minutes*, pp. 13—15.

Why this Minute has not been transferred, along with other papers relating to the Union Schools scheme, to the volume specifically devoted to this subject, we are, of course, unable to explain. The omission could hardly be accidental; and from the fact that the account given of the Kneller Hall establishment in the Parliamentary return does not tally with the scheme set out in the Minute, it would appear that subsequent Minutes must have superseded it. At the same time no such further Minute, nor any document whatever, calculated to throw light upon the internal organization of Kneller Hall, is given in the Parliamentary return. The only information contained in the Parliamentary return, beyond the short extract from Sir G. Grey's letter of the 18th of November, 1846 (see p. 111), and the Minute of the 21st of December, 1846, given above, is the following statement:—

"Pursuant to this Minute, and with the approval of Her Majesty's

Commissioners of Woods and Forests, and with the consent of the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, an estate at Kneller Hall, comprising about 45*a.* 1*r.* 24*p.*, was purchased for 10,500*l.*, or, including interest on purchase-money from the 8th of August to the 17th of September, 1847, for 10,557*l.* 10*s.* 6*d.* The expenses attending the title and conveyance amounted to 366*l.* 8*s.* 5*d.*

"A contract with the builder has been entered into for 17,336*l.* 6*s.* 2*d.*, with subsequent additions, amounting to 1,788*l.* 0*s.* 5*d.*,[8] with the same approval and consent.

"Fixtures of various kinds, exclusively of furniture, have been contracted for to the amount of 2,293*l.* 9*s.*[9]

"A clerk of the works has been employed for 68 weeks, at 4*l.* 14*s.* 6*d.* per week, 321*l.* 6*s.* A gardener and general workman, living on the premises, has been employed for 63 weeks, at 18*s.* per week, 56*l.* 14*s.*; and for 26 weeks, at 20*s.* per week, 26*l.* Total expense of servants up to present time, 404*l.*

"Miscellaneous expenses, such as repairs, &c., 422*l.* 19*s.* 5½*d.*; against which is to be set proceeds of sale of grass and crops, 236*l.* 16*s.*; balance of expenses, 186*l.* 3*s.* 5½*d.*

"The foregoing expenses are charged upon the grant annually voted by Parliament for education.

"The officers already appointed, are :—

"1. The Rev. F. Temple, M.A., lately Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, Principal, at a salary of 600*l.* per annum, to rise to 800*l.* in three years, with a furnished house.

"2. F. T. Palgrave, Esq., Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, Vice-Principal, at a salary of 400*l.* per annum, to rise to 500*l.* in three years, with furnished rooms.

"3. Mr. Tate, one of the masters in the Battersea Normal School (author of some of the most approved works connected with elementary instruction, and a highly successful teacher), third master.

"4. Mr. Tilleard, formerly a student at Norwood and Battersea, and for some time a pupil of M. Fellenberg, fourth master."

Though it is here stated in general terms, that "the foregoing expenses are charged upon the grant annually voted by Parliament for education," it does not appear exactly how this large outlay was met. It is by no means improbable that the amount was

	£	*s.*	*d.*
[8] Library and reading room	498	0	5
Baths and Washhouses	540	0	0
Works connected with supply of water	750	0	0
[9] Gas fittings	296	14	0
Iron work in kitchen	366	10	0
Iron work in baths	363	15	0
Bells	16	10	0
Warming apparatus	300	0	0
Waterworks	950	0	0

saved out of the 30,000*l.* grant for workhouse schoolmasters and mistresses which came into operation on the 1st of October, 1846. Of the appropriation of this money, amounting to the close of the current quarter to 90,000*l.*, no account appears in the volume before us; the salaries, according to the scale fixed by the Commissioners, did not come into operation till the 1st of April of the present year; and, up to the end of June last, the annual salaries sanctioned by the Committee of Council did not amount to more than 10,974*l.* 16*s.*—This one year alone, therefore, would leave a large balance at the disposal of the Committee; and, whatever may have been the payments made under the previous arrangements, it is hardly to be supposed that they greatly, if at all, exceeded the above amount. In any event there must have been a large margin left, for defraying the expense of the five inspectors, and, it is not unreasonable to suppose, for the erection of Kneller Hall. The first grant specifically for Kneller Hall, was for 18,000*l.* in the present year; yet the Hall is already built at an outlay, including the purchase of the site, of upwards of 30,000*l.*, as was correctly stated by the *John Bull* in July. But even then no intimation was given of the nature of the Kneller Hall establishment, nor, we may be sure, would the unostentatious character of the whole of the proceedings connected with it have been dragged into light, but for the disclosures which took place through the vigilance of the friends of the Church, and the consequent inquiries in and out of Parliament. The money, therefore, which has been spent upon this establishment is money spent *distinctly without Parliamentary sanction*, for an object *distinctly repudiated by Parliament*. The discovery having taken place so late in the Session (the return being "ordered to be printed" on the day of the prorogation) rendered it impossible for Parliament to follow up the inquiry; but we trust that the surreptitious manner in which 30,000*l.* has been spent, literally behind the back of Parliament, in pursuance of a scheme against which, had it been honestly announced and canvassed beforehand, the country would have risen as one man, will not be suffered to escape next Session, but that the whole of this flagrant transaction will then be brought under the consideration of both Houses, and the entire Poor Law Education Scheme, of which Kneller Hall is the *focus*, dealt with according to its deserts.

Meanwhile it will not be uninteresting to investigate the capabilities of Kneller Hall, as far as they can be ascertained by examining the lithographs before mentioned. On them we have counted eighty-six dormitories—besides the principal's and master's bedrooms—of the average dimensions of 8 feet by 12; capable, therefore, of accommodating at least two beds each, or, in the whole, making

allowance for the sleeping accommodation of domestics, at least 160 to 180 candidate teachers. This calculation is confirmed by the size of the dining-hall, 30′ 6″ by 29′ 6″, in which there would certainly be room for five tables seating thirty-two persons each; and by the size of the "oratory," 36 feet by 21, also large enough to accommodate about that number. On comparing the Minute of the 21st of December, 1846, which speaks of 100 candidate teachers, with Mr. Kay Shuttleworth's letter, on which the Minute is founded, and which supposes an annual supply of fifty teachers, it would appear that two years is the average period fixed for training, and that, therefore, Kneller Hall is capable of providing eighty teachers per annum.

The question, then, arises, what employment there could be for eighty schoolmasters issuing annually from this academy of secular knowledge and "general religion." The workhouse-schools are, as we have seen, from 600 to 700 in number; and of the old masters 226 have already obtained certificates. About 400 new masters, therefore, is the very outside of what can be required, and these would be supplied in the course of five years; after which there would be no market for the *alumni* of Kneller Hall, supposing them to be destined for workhouse-schools only. But even this is reckoning upon a far larger demand than will actually occur, the Committee of Council having determined upon the formation of district schools in which the children of from four to five unions would be collected together. After this measure shall have been effected, there will be from 150 to 180 district schools at most; a number abundantly sufficient, at the rate of from 140 to 160 boys in each school, to accommodate 25,000, that is the total number of boys, being one half of the 50,000 children under inspection in workhouse-schools. Now it is quite impossible to suppose that an establishment able to roduce eighty new teachers per annum should be set on foot for supplying say 180 schools. We know from Mr. Kay Shuttleworth's letter that he reckons the average servitude of each master at twelve years; consequently 180 schools would not require more than fifteen teachers per annum; and the supply, therefore, would be more than five times the demand. Comparing this with what has before been stated as to the contemplated extension of the scheme to the children of out-door paupers, we have a remarkable confirmation of the conclusion to which we were led by the remarks of Mr. Symons. For schools containing upwards of 200,000 boys, an annual supply of eighty masters will not be too much, yielding, with an average servitude of twelve years, the requisite number of recruits to keep up a staff of 960 masters, or one master to about 200 boys.

There is, however, a further question which suggests itself. It

is this: If Kneller Hall provides masters sufficient not only for the in-door but for the out-door paupers' children, detaining each master for twelve years in the service of the pauper education department, what is to become of all those teachers when their period of servitude shall have expired? Supposing the pupil-teachers of the pauper schools, who are to recruit the Kneller Hall establishment, to be transferred to it between the ages of sixteen and eighteen, they would, after remaining at the Hall for two years, and conducting a pauper school for twelve years, be in the very prime of life at the end of their servitude, and, if replaced by other men, they must necessarily seek employment in other schools. Into what market, then, would they be thrown?

The answer is obvious. The Committee of Council have long sought a quarrel with the National Society, and have got it at last. While they have thrown every obstacle in the way of cordial co-operation with them on the part of the Church, they have made every preparation for meeting the emergency of an open rupture. While consistent clergymen may be compelled to forego all assistance from the State for the foundation and support of their schools, and Diocesan Training Institutions may have to contract their operations, partly from a diminution of their funds through the loss of State assistance, and partly from a decrease in the demand for strict Church schoolmasters, the Committee of Council will be ready to supply, from their stores at Kneller Hall, teachers after their own heart to any parochial school, where the clergyman shall, either with a view to pay his court to the powers that be, or to a latitudinarian diocesan, or else from dire necessity, be induced to accept State assistance, and a State-trained master. Thus by a gradual but sure process, by an insensible expansion of the State system of education, and a progressive cramping and hampering of the Church, that great change will in due time be brought about, against which the Church raised her voice ten years ago in solemn protest.

The change will be brought about, that is to say, if the Church is sufficiently blind to the machinations of her enemies, and sufficiently supine and unfaithful to her trust, to permit their schemes to be carried into effect. But we hope for better things. The Education battle is about to be fought between the Church and the Committee of Council. The coming session of Parliament will on this subject be decisive; and it is not amiss, therefore, that the Kneller Hall scheme should have exploded at this very time, completing the evidence, if evidence were needed, of the perfidious designs of that most unconstitutional, as well as arbitrary, of State authorities, the Committee of Council on Education. Let only Churchmen in general, and the clergy in particular, remember the sacredness and weightiness of their trust

in this matter, which is a trust not only for the good deposit of God's truth and ordinance, but for the souls of the poor committed to their keeping; a trust which we cannot better describe than in the forcible language of Archdeacon Manning, in his recent Charge:—

"We are the guardians of the children of the poor—the busy, the over-laboured, the untaught, of all who need instruction; and this wardship none but the parents themselves can revoke. We should betray our trust to our Master and to our flocks if we suffered any person or power to come between us and the children of our people. So long as their parents confide them to us, none may take them away.

"When we speak, therefore, of the laity, we do not mean a number of politicians, nor a handful of benevolent theorists, nor a few active friends of education, nor the subscribers of 10*s.* or 20*s.* a-year to a parish school, but the great multitude of our people, and specially the heads of houses and families throughout the ten thousand homes of our land. In the name of this great multitude, in the name of the poor of Christ, and in the name of the whole body on whom the baptism of Christ has impressed the spiritual priesthood of faith, we, as pastors, taken from among them and set apart, not for ourselves but for their sakes, to be the servants of their necessities, and the trustees of their spiritual inheritance, are bound in duty to stand firm against the assumption of the sacred name of laity by any other person or persons whatsoever. Let the true laity be called on to speak for itself; not, I say, the handful of those who can afford a few yearly shillings to vote in school committees, but the millions of the free and great flock tended by fifteen thousand pastors,—let them say to whom they will intrust the care and oversight of their children, the guardianship of their Christian rights, and the execution of their Christian duties, and we shall readily acquiesce in their decision. In so popular a question, nothing less than the voice of the people ought to decide it.

"If the laity of the Church are to be invoked, it must be not the laity of wealth—the laity of any particular grade—not a class-laity, but the laity of the whole people of Christ. As pastors and trustees for the rights of parents, we hold in their name and by their powers the guardianship they have intrusted to us over the education of their children. No experiment may be tried upon them; and the voice of the poor father who cannot contribute ten yearly pence to the parish school, where his child is taught, is weightier than the vote of all those who have confided to us no such sacred trust. When a fraction of the laity is invoked, we must invoke the whole, the whole flock of Christ in this land; and they, be it remembered, have not as yet spoken, and are not as yet represented in this great question. They and all they hold dearest are at stake, and yet they have neither voice nor vote. In behalf of those who have been solemnly committed to us, and whose representatives in this their deepest interest we are, we are entitled to be heard, speaking in the name of the laity."—*Archdeacon Manning's Charge*, 1849, pp. 65—67.

ART. VII.—*Essays. By* R. W. EMERSON. *Nature, an Essay, Orations, &c. &c.*

THE reputation enjoyed by that "transatlantic thinker," whose name we have set forth in the heading to these remarks, suggests matter for grave reflection. When we find an essayist of this description, who seems to be "a setter forth of new gods," belauded alike by Tory and Radical organs, by "Blackwood" and "the Westminster," by the friends of order and disorder—when we find his works reproduced in every possible form, and at the most tempting prices, proving the wide circulation they must enjoy amongst the English public generally—we feel that we too should not leave them disregarded, that we should bestow something more than the mere incidental notice on them which we have hitherto found occasion to indite. We are credibly informed that these essays find many readers and admirers amongst the youth of our universities. Here is a more special "moving cause" for our examination into this theme,—the "rationale" of what we may well call the Emerson mania. We shall discuss a few of the leading tenets of the Emersonian philosophy, as calmly and dispassionately as we may; and, if we give offence to the idolaters of this "transatlantic star," we can only say that truth is too serious a matter to be trifled with, and that we hold ourselves bound, in this instance, to speak out plainly. To plunge, then, "in medias res,"

"'Tis true, 'tis pity; pity 'tis, 'tis true!"

But men in this age, ay, and women too, grow weary of truth and reason: sober sense offends, and unity annoys them; they long for a concert of harmonious discords to wake them from their drowsy lethargy. To the mental palate, thus diseased, novelty is the chief provocative. A new cook comes, and mingles poison with his sauces. What then? The flavour is pungent, and a moral evil may often be an intellectual pleasure.

Some reflection of this nature is needed to re-assure us when we see men and women, whom we have believed sensible and amiable, hailing the glare of such a treacherous marshlight as the American paradox-master before us, as though it were the advent of a new and brilliant star. Mingled considerations oppress us in treating such a theme: on the one hand, our knowledge of the great mischief wrought in so many cases by this mighty phrasemonger

would urge severest ridicule as the first of duties; on the other, there is really such an amount of showy cleverness, of external brilliancy, and, now and then, of even happy audacity, about this quasi-philosopher, that we feel we should not do him justice, nor have any chance of reducing him to his rightful level in the estimation of his rapt admirers, did we not testify our sense of those merits which, in some degree, excuse their adoration, and which cannot fail to strike the most prejudiced observer.

True it is, that when a man throws forth thoughts at random, as Emerson does, without the smallest regard to self-consistency or reality, he cannot fail, here and there, to light on a quarter, or a half truth, or perhaps even on a whole one. Let a man possessed of a competent knowledge of counter-point sit many hours at a piano, forcing the chords into endless combinations, now and then a happy musical idea can scarcely fail to flit across the air; small praise to the strummer! The man of higher taste and nobler imagination would far rather abide under the imputation of barrenness, than afflict his own soul and senses by the production of the false, the common, and the vile. There is a certain order of wealth that is near akin to poverty.

What shall we think of *his* philosophy, who can seriously tell us, "With *consistency* a great soul has simply nothing to do?" Order is divine: disorder is a blot, an error, an absurdity. How, then, shall we esteem *his* wisdom, who boasts, "I unsettle all things. No facts are to me sacred; none are profane; I simply experiment, an endless seeker, with no past at my back?" Unconnectedly does this writer jerk forth his sayings; here is a perception, there a second, there a third; make the most of them! only ask not for sequence or completeness! And yet a myriad waves *apart* will make but one wide and desolate swamp; blend half of these in one, and a broad lake spreads forth, to mirror the azure skies, and refresh the eye with beauty.

Nevertheless, despite this vagueness and seeming boundlessness of thought, we soon learn that the philosophy of Mr. Emerson (if we may so call it) is restricted within a system's narrow limits, as well as that of his neighbours; there is no logic in his form of utterance, certainly, but by-and-by we begin to perceive that he is trading on a small stock of positive ideas, though he casts them into so many incongruous shapes, and is at so little pains to reconcile one with the other. We find that this essayist has a science, a morality, a *religion* of his own, and that, with all his pretensions to indefinite catholicity, he tests all things (as from the infirmity of man's nature he must needs do) by this special standard.

The one cardinal error of Emerson is to take the unit for the mass, the individual for the universal, the ego for Deity. With all

his contempt for those more sensible thinkers than himself, who have assented to a revealed scheme as truth absolute, and hold all other truths in subordination to that master-principle, he yet constantly, nay, continuously, assumes that human nature and the world are what *he* sees them to be, and *can be* nothing beyond this. He confounds relative with absolute existence. He seems to fancy the stars *are not*, until *we* behold them. Because to us, and for us, individually, things only are as we receive them, he conceives that fact and truth are dependent upon *our* perceptions. He regards man as a constantly inspired "revealer of the absolute;" we use, in a degree, his own cant, to render ourselves acceptable to any of his deluded admirers, who may possibly be found amongst the readers of this article. He fancies that what he calls "the over-soul," or universal reason, is *potentially* common to all, but actually possessed only by those who are *inspired;* and these he regards as the infallible teachers of humanity.

Nevertheless, let it not be supposed that the errors of Emerson are those of Carlyle; that the former is only an imitator and disciple of the latter. Emerson, though less brilliant, and perhaps less genial, certainly endowed with less descriptive or dramatic power, is the better thinker of the twain: though here, if ever, is the place to say "*bad is the best!*" Carlyle, however, inculcates the worship of genius; Emerson denounces all adoration save that of self: Carlyle is by nature a mental slave; and Emerson the embodiment of self-glorification. The one commands us to kneel in the dust before *force*, whether displayed for good or evil, as being in its essence divine; the other forbids us to set the most glorious actions, the most mighty works, above, or even on an equality with, our own private notions of them. Which of these creeds is more mischievous, it were difficult to say: the cant of either is disagreeable; but we should say that that of the idol-worshipper was the more odious, that of the self-idolater the more absurd. When the man, whom we know to place no faith in the bare existence of his God, echoes with rapturous and servile adulation the scriptural phrases of the Puritanic world, because emblematic to him of a real *trust* of some kind, which he is unable to share, we cannot but feel disgust; but we laugh outright at the comic self-sufficiency of that teacher who cries with a sober face and earnest voice, "If *I* see a trait, my children will see it after me, and, in course of time, all mankind—for *my* perception of it is as much a fact as the sun."

But should we not, perhaps, go more steadily to work, and say a few words—a very few, on each of the first twelve Essays in the volume before us, leaving "Nature," and "Addresses," and "Orations," for some future occasion, or rather altogether on

one side? For, in truth, owing to the small number (already hinted at) of Mr. Emerson's real notions (we will not say, ideas), the careful consideration of a single page, taken at random from his writings, would almost exhaust the theme. But let us proceed in order due.

First, then, our author discourses on "History," in which discourse his aim is to set forth his one great principle, that each man must assume *his* superiority to present, past, and future, subject these to his own nature, and receive or reject them without the slightest regard for authority, or apparently any external testimony whatever. And here let us remark, how very acceptable such teaching must have been, must still be, to weak, silly, half-formed youths, and all other inferior natures, which have too much vanity to know true honest pride, and would gladly think their own small "self" the epitome, nay, the circle, of the universe. Mr. Emerson says it *is* so. Hear him! (let us pass over the blasphemy of his motto!) "There is one mind common to all individual men." How satisfactory! Nay, more: "He that is once admitted to the right of reason is made a freeman of the whole estate." Is *this* not sufficiently explicit? Know, then, "What Plato has thought, *he* may think; what a saint has felt, *he* may feel; what at any time has befallen any man, *he* can understand. Who hath access to this universal mind is a party to all that is or can be done; for this is the only and sovereign agent." Very intelligible, and very reasonable, no doubt; and, above all, conducive to modesty. But this is only "the starting;" our American warms with his theme: "A man," that is, each man, "is the whole encyclopædia of facts." What a pleasing conviction! Youth behind the counter, rejoice: for thou art All, and the All is in thee. Thou hast been wont to consider thyself a learner: know that the teachers of all ages shall come and bow down themselves before thee! "The moon" is in "the turnip" at last. How intoxicating must be this draught of self-delusive nectar to the imagination of many an honest boy!

Mr. Emerson simply puts out of question the great facts, that human perceptions of the Infinite must be finite at best, and that two of the greatest, and highest, and deepest sources of our conviction are authority and reverence. Nine-tenths of our material knowledge even we must take on trust: we cannot prove all things for ourselves. How, then, should we be entitled to conclude that our individual perceptions of moral and religious truth must be higher, and clearer, and more worthy than those of genius and of holiness? True it is, that to us, finally, our own sense of things must be the nearest and most important, though it

follows not, as Mr. Emerson assumes, that things *are*, because we think we see them. But, then, how is this sense *formed* which is to be our ultimate guide? The stanchest stickler for private judgment cannot reasonably affirm, that this should not be modified by those external aids which are here so unceremoniously rejected, or rather seemingly forgotten. Truth, Mr. Emerson, is not dependent upon perception. The great is great, the beautiful is beautiful, whether you or we see it or not. We may exclude the glorious sunshine, by absolutely closing our eyes to its beams; but we cannot force the daylight to fade because we blind ourselves.

"Why should we make account of time, or of magnitude, or of form?—the soul knows them not!" Really! but the soul *does* know them; and if yours is ignorant, good "essayist," confined to the contemplation of your own ego, be assured that you are nothing but an isolated straw, driven to and fro by the breeze, without any fixed place in the wide world of spirits! History is, indeed, only of interest in as far as it speaks to the soul; but, if it does not speak to it, it follows not that history is barren, but more probably, that the soul is shallow, and "dead in life."

It were endless to comment on all the self-contradictions of this writer; but it is amusing to find one who refers all things back to the individual ego, assuming that the human mind could not devise the form of a cherub, nor of a scroll to abut a tower, until it had seen some cloud or snowdrift, suggestive of these forms. The combinations of the imagination are endless; they may, they will, find their counterparts in nature; but they need not be stolen from it, though little minds will always conceive them so to be.

The atheism of the writer peeps out pretty broadly, where he commends the "Prometheus Bound," as emblematic of man's natural opposition to pure *Theism*, "his self-defence against *this untruth*," "*a discontent with the believed fact, that a God exists.*" Very pretty, Mr. Emerson; very pretty, indeed; and well-meaning young men study you with reverence, and young ladies dote upon you—poor innocents! Finally, "History shall walk incarnate in every wise and just man;" in every self-trusting philosopher, in every Emerson, in fine, or Emersonian! And, when we have once ascertained this fact, why not shut up our books, and begin to live history ourselves? After all, we are we, and all is in us. There is no resisting such arguments. We cannot wonder that simple souls should be fascinated and overpowered. But we would say to all that have thus been led astray, (and would that our voice could reach them!) return to

the paths of reason, and bathe your spirits in light; learn to revere! *learn to learn!* Believe us, you shall not be "*the less*" for it.

Let us move onward. The Essay on "Self-Reliance" meets us next, and this is bolder still. "To believe your own thoughts, to believe that what is true for you in your private heart is true for all men,—that is *Genius.*" And happily this genius, we find, may be the lot of all, at least of every Emersonian: the fact is strongly urged upon them throughout these Essays. "Speak *your* latent conviction, and it shall be the universal sense!" But it will not do for us to be for ever quoting these eternal strummings upon one false note. Our readers must already see, that there is a unity of some kind in Mr. Emerson's multiplicities and contradictions.

But a very little more need be cited here: the precious fruits of this doctrine concerning individual infallibility must be seen to be estimated. Further on, then, we read: "No law can be sacred to me but that of my own nature: good or bad are but names, very readily transferable to that or this; the only right is what is after my constitution, the only wrong what is against it." A convenient doctrine verily! We are ready to give Mr. Emerson credit for the best possible *intentions;* but perhaps his admirers will be disposed to admit, that such teaching is not *quite safe.*

We find it difficult to say, how infinitely petty this self-idolatry appears to us, as manifested in its fear of all influences from without. Let us be ourselves! Let us live for whim, if *we* are only *we!* Let us not be swayed by fact or truth! Let us isolate our souls at any risk; and, then, we must be original, and, being infallible, must grow divine. And are there thousands of good people who have swallowed all this? Why do not they remember, that while they love God and man aright, nothing can deprive them of their individuality? Influenced they must indeed be, whether they like it or no, by a thousand foreign causes. They cannot grow up "all alone," and *have a world to themselves!* It is very hard, certainly; but God *will* guide us and control us; and even our fellow-creatures *will* sway us and form us, and in no slight degree govern us, however stern may be our resolve of independence. "Be a Non-conformist!" cries Mr. Emerson: "so can you alone be great." Alas! we may protest on one or two special points; but, if we mean to live with our fellow-men, we *must conform* in all important particulars, or we shall find ourselves outlaws indeed.

After a strong fling on the part of our philosophic friend at "conformity and consistency," which he dooms as "ridiculous,"

and of which he devoutly hopes to have heard the last, we have much more repetition, and then some inflated pantheism or atheism,—we prefer the plainer phrase. Much is prated respecting "Instinct" and "Intuition," on which it would be a pity to waste time and good paper. All things are to be wrought, not for the sake of good, absolute good, but to please the "ego." We will not waste more words on this folly. Then prayers are denounced; all prayers, at least, save *action:* they are "a disease of will." Man himself is God, or at least the purest embodiment of the "over-soul." Prayer, therefore, is "meanness," nay, absurdity. "*It supposes dualism and not unity in nature and consciousness.*" That is, it supposes man and God to be two, whereas they are only one. "Sancta simplicitas!" in people, who would stare at you grievously affronted, and would even have a right to be so, if you called them no Christians, and yet who admire this blasphemous rubbish. Ah, poor Emerson! can *you* believe this sad twaddle? or do you not happily vindicate here that character for inconsistency of which you are so proud? Have you really never had occasion to pray for a child, or wife, or for yourself? If not, how very great, or (in strictest confidence) how very small your soul must be! Are you really fearful, in your vanity, to acknowledge the Almighty providence above you, of which you are the unwilling servant, nay, the slave? For

"Blindly the wicked work the will of Heaven!"

Not that we would believe you wicked; far from it! we think a human being could scarcely write with such weak audacity who realized his own theories. You must be better than you imagine for.

The life of man is a life of grace: grace created, redeemed, sustains him. Didst thou make thyself, or thy world? Are not the evidences of infinite design around thee? Tell us not of an antiquated argument, when we utter the revelation of the human heart. Individuality is essential to every particle, to every form, in creation: a thing that is not individual is nothing. We may cheat ourselves with words, if we think fit; but A GOD, who could not love, who did not guide, who would not keep us, if we sought him, who did not in fine hear prayer, were no God at all, were nothing better than a non-entity. Either nature is divine and self-created, or there is One Supreme who permeates the visible universe, but to whom that universe is but as a viewless speck in a boundless ocean of glory. And to this All-Infinite nothing can be great, nothing small; He hears, He loves the humblest child of clay. But since, in truth, the human intellect might sink in the contemplation of this

amazing mystery, God has become visible in man, incarnate in the *Lord Christ Jesus.* This Revelation stands on a pinnacle, which all storms and tempests must assault in vain, lofty as the highest aspirations of the soul, yet broad and plain as truth. Unless we chose to believe our Lord and his Apostles (may we dare to write the word?) *impostors*, and the whole sacred volume one comprehensive falsehood, (and how, feeling its holiness, its sublimity, knowing the glorious self-sacrifice of its originators, can we attain to this Voltairean audacity?) what must remain for us? Nothing but to love, tremble, and adore!

We will not waste words on Mr. Emerson's most monstrous hypothesis, that "the Everlasting Son" proclaimed only the Godhead of all humanity when He announced his own. *He* must be a narrow-minded fanatic indeed to his own vain and silly creed, who can persist in such an error as this. But Mr. Emerson's self-sufficiency never deserts him. "Men's creeds," he says, "are a disease of the intellect." He has said it! We had better let the subject rest, or this profound teacher will annihilate our simple faith.

And now the "teacher" digresses, and descends a little to anathematise "travelling." It is, he informs us, "a fool's paradise."—"*I* seek the Vatican;" "*I* affect to be intoxicated," &c., "but *I* am *not* intoxicated." We can well believe it. But are we really compelled to accept your standard, friend, because "a fact perceived by you becomes of necessity one for all ages?" If so, we wish you would cultivate more pleasant perceptions, and, on mature reflection, consent to think better even of travelling.

We have some more rather clever though paradoxical talk respecting Society's never advancing, but we cannot pause to examine it: it is one of those few approaches to a half truth which this writer sometimes stumbles on, perhaps against his will.

Next, he treats of "Compensation:" his reprobation of a certain clergyman and his congregation is highly comic. The doctrine complained of is, the belief of mankind that another world is needed to set right the inequalities of this. Of course, there *is* compensation even here: in a certain sense, and in a degree, the good may be said to be the happy, and the evil the unhappy on our earth; *but* there is such a thing as callous triumphant sensuality, or as virtuous woe. Good hearts do break sometimes; bad hearts do rejoice, after their kind, up to the very hour of their departure. Who has not seen instances in his own individual experience? We will not follow Mr. Emerson's "arguments" on this head. We advance to another theme. When he tells us, then, the true doctrine of *Omnipresence* is, that God re-appears

with all his parts in every moss and cobweb, we can only repeat our former query, Can the man, who gives utterance to such wholesale rubbish, place any confidence in it himself? We trow not.

In this Essay there are, however, some striking ideas, some few happy images, some self-evident indeed and very harmless truths, which are, nevertheless, utterances of the honest human understanding. The whole is one of those "talkifications" which make us hope that the *man* is better than his "philosophy."

Next, "Spiritual Laws" come on the tapis, and are discussed in the former strain: we find less and less of novel matter or treatment to record. Self—self—self—is the eternal cry, though it finds utterance in many illustrations, some happy and some unhappy. We do not altogether dislike a bold passage towards the conclusion, and, by way of fair play, we will quote it: "Let the great soul, incarnated in some woman's form, poor and sad and single, in some Doll or Jane, go out to service, and sweep chambers and scour floors, and its effulgent daybeams cannot be muffled or hid; but to sweep and scour will instantly appear supreme and beautiful actions, the top and radiance of human life, and all people will get mops and brooms, until, lo, suddenly the great soul has enshrined itself in some other form, and done some other deed, and that is now the flower and head of all living nature." There is truth in this, despite the grotesque exaggeration: how it agrees with the remainder of Mr. Emerson's system rests not with us to explain. It might have been Carlyle's.

Now comes a paper on "Love," which we rather like: but after an eloquent passage about lovers, which has some poetry in it, and much else that may, perhaps, by courtesy be counted "*very clever*," and to which we are anxious, as opponents, to give all due credit, the old troublesome notions show themselves, and suggestions are made that we should only love for the sake of what we get for *self*; that "our affections are but tents of a night," &c. But we will not pause for further cavils here, however just. We quote one pleasing passage, which recalls, as we fancy, something either in Washington Irving, or in Bulwer's "Eugene Aram," that book so striking and so artistic despite its partial immorality. "The rude village-boy teazes the girls about the school-house door; but to-day he comes running into the entry, and meets one fair child arranging her satchel: he holds her books, to help her, and instantly it seems to him as if she removed herself from him infinitely, and was a sacred precinct. Among the throng of girls he runs rudely enough, but one alone distances him: and these two little neighbours, that were so close just now, have learnt to respect each other's personality." Oh! Mr. Emerson, if you

would more frequently condescend to observe, and give up aspiring *to teach!* Be assured, nobody listens to your philosophic twaddle: nobody at least who has a *mind*, worthy of the name, an independent intellect such as you admire. But let us not be too crabbed over this paper.

The essay on "Friendship" is far more objectionable; inflated in language, and misty in sentiment. We cannot exactly make out what Mr. Emerson wants, whether his friends should be friends indeed, through weal and woe, or merely sympathisers, for he states the case both ways, backwards and forwards, twice or thrice, and we are not quite sure where he ultimately settles. There is all the difference in the world betwixt an alliance founded not only on mutual esteem, but also on mutual assurance of active and sincere regard, and a mere literary or æsthetic sympathy, which seems to be what this author aims at as his ideal of true friendship. These sympathies of taste or of imagination may be very pleasant things in their way, and are so; they are like some beautiful forest-glade which we chance to encounter on our pilgrimage, where we rest for the noon-tide hour, but whence we start again with only a momentary regret; they make no deep impression on the *heart*. Compared with the substance of true friendship, they are only shadows, however fresh and green, and "kindly." When sympathy unites men on higher themes than those commanding a mere literary interest, (such a theme, for instance, as religion,) where both feel themselves working for a great good, the benefit of their fellow-men, or the glory of God, this communion of thought and feeling approaches the nature of true friendship, and, under favourable circumstances, may easily ripen into that noble bond. But we must not allow ourselves to be longer detained by Mr. Emerson's transcendental speculations.—Some part of what he says on "Prudence" seems sufficiently prudent, as far as we can make out a definite intention, and, indeed, there are various happy passages in this little essay which might repay perusal. Prudence, we may venture to remark, is little known to Mr. Emerson, though he discourses so learnedly on the theme. Were he gifted with that prudence, of which modesty seems an essential element, he would scarcely have perpetrated the majority of the essays before us, and we should therefore not have had to hold him up as a sad warning against the very error he condemns (Imprudence)—

"To point *his* moral, and adorn *his* tale."

"Heroism" is, of course, another variation of the old strain "be *thyself*, and therefore all that is wonderful and perfect!" It is chiefly remarkable for its characteristic praises

of "Beaumont and Fletcher," whose flashy noisy vanities and pompous boastings, placed in the mouths of their constantly contemptible and wonderfully inconsistent heroes and heroines, have evidently far more attraction for Mr. Emerson's fancy than the calm, quiet greatness of Shakspeare's men and women, who rarely deal in these grandiose protestations,—characters such as the calm Pagan "Brutus," seduced to ill, indeed, but noble in his fall; or the cheerful Christian hero, "Henry the Fifth," so truly *great* in all things, and therefore not ashamed of kneeling to his God, and ascribing all glory to Him only.

We have some pleasant glimpses of the nature of "mob-sway" in this paper, calculated to inspire us with no little gratitude that universal suffrage is not yet established among ourselves; that the monster many are not supreme, that the sober middle classes and "gallant" upper classes retain their due influence. Now follows an essay on "the Over-soul." As may be suspected from the title, this is very *transcendental;* and having already dealt with its "philosophy," which is but another variation of the old weary strain, we shall leave it alone in its glory. It contains, we may observe, a vast amount of blasphemy, and is altogether extremely offensive.

The paper on "Circles" is more amusing, though this contains much of mischievous audacity also. What a pity is it that men will write on subjects of which they do not understand the very elements! Here, for instance, we are told that "we can never see Christianity from the catechism," as if a man who does not recognise the existence of a God had any right to teach Christians the nature of Christianity; and this announcement is followed up by a very impertinent, not to say, impious gloss on what Mr. Emerson calls "a brave text of Paul's." We shall not trouble our readers with it. What *the last facts of philosophy* are in this thinker's estimation, we may learn from the following extract, which only "caps" a long passage, couched in the self-same strain:—"The poor and the low have their way of expressing the last facts of philosophy as well as you. 'Blessed be nothing,' and 'the worse things are the better they are,' are proverbs which express the transcendentalism of common life." It is a kind of circular indifferentism, inferring that good things and bad all come to one end at last, which is here aimed at by our philosopher. But the part of this essay, in which the writer's inordinate, and we could almost say delightful, conceit (did it not prove so mischievous in its effects) displays itself to most advantage, is perhaps the following:—"Beware when the great God lets loose *a thinker* on this planet! *Then all things are at risk!* It is as when a conflagration has broken out in a great city, and

no man knows what is safe, *or where it will end!* There is not a piece of science, but its flank may be turned to-morrow; there is not any literary reputation, not the so-called eternal names of fame, that may not be revised and condemned. *The very hopes of man, the thoughts of his heart, the religion of nations, the manners and morals of mankind, are all at the mercy of a new generalization!* Generalization is always an influx of the divinity into the mind. Hence the thrill that attends it." This delicious morceau we have extracted in full; indeed, we had not the heart to curtail it. We are not aware that we have ever met with a passage in which the *vis comica* is carried to a higher point of daring. The first outbreak, after the letting loose of "the thinker," is delightful! "*All things are at risk.*" Good reader, do you not tremble? The subsequent climax is tremendous:—"hopes of man," "religion of nations," "morals of mankind,"—all at the mercy of this awful "thinker," who is to extirpate them all, if he so pleases, by means of a mysterious battle-axe, "a generalization!" Here the image is irresistibly suggested of a Will o' the Wisp, dancing up and down upon his little swamp, impressed with the firm conviction, as far as firmness can pertain to so volatile a creature, that nothing but his merciful forbearance prevents his setting moon, and stars, and universe in flames, by means of his potent tail and fiery beard. But when honest people are found to run after this inflated marshlight, and incur no little danger of sinking in the swampy ground on which it flourishes, being likely at all events to plunge up to the chin in mud and water, and sure not to escape without many a miry strain,—this grotesque extravagance becomes something more than a laughing matter, and calls for severe reprehension and rebuke. By-the-by, this very Mr. Emerson was employed in America to harangue *a large body of theological students, dispersing to their pastoral cares.* What a satisfactory idea does this give us of American orthodoxy in essentials! We do not mean to suggest that all religious bodies in America were represented at the university in question,—we humbly trust that the Episcopal Church was not. But we digress.

The paper on "Intellect" contains little that is novel, excepting a very preposterous outburst at its conclusion in favour of the old pagan philosophers Hermes, Empedocles, Olympiodorus, Synesius, &c. How much, we venture to inquire, does Mr. Emerson really know of these men? How much has he really read of their compositions? We suspect that this is an instance in which the trite "Omne Ignotum pro Magnifico" may find an apt and needful application. But Mr. Emerson dwells in a world of shadows, and therefore these pagan unrealities might well call forth his ardent sympathy. Men of this author's order

like everything which they do not understand; mainly, we suppose, because self-admiration is their unfailing characteristic, and they rarely, if ever, understand themselves.

The twelfth and last Essay treats of "Art," and is designed to teach us, that the date of poetry, painting, sculpture, and music has expired; nevertheless, we are to take comfort, and cultivate art still, "in eating and drinking," and further, "in the shop and mill, the assurance-office and the joint-stock company,"—an appropriate American conclusion, against which it is scarcely worth our while to protest. There is something infinitely amusing in the tone of patronage to art which our "thinker" assumes. Hear him once more! He has just condescended to bestow some praises on certain pictures of Raffaelle's, and now continues:—"Yet, when *we* have said all *our fine things* about the arts, we must end *with a frank confession*, that the arts, as we know them, are but initial." Afterwards we learn, "they are abortive births of an imperfect or vitiated instinct;" but here the philosopher soars too high for our weak senses to follow him. In sober truth, we have but another instance here of that inordinate vanity which is Mr. Emerson's most besetting literary sin. Not possessing genius himself, being unable to create a great picture, or a real poem, or an oratorio, and only gifted with the unfortunate faculty (however common) of writing high-sounding twaddle about each and all of them, he is extremely anxious to convince the world and himself that this twaddle is quite as great or greater than the works of art in question, and that an Emerson is equal to a Shakspeare, a Raffaelle, or a Beethoven. The puddle from the tanning-yard, not content with troubling the lake's purity, goes bubbling, and hissing, and steaming on, as though it were lord of all, and the lake were only there that it might be able to sail about in it and defile the azure waters. But let us waste no more words on this exhibition of absurdity.

We shall now draw these observations to a close, noted down for the benefit of some, whose eyes, under God's blessing, they may in some degree avail to open. Certainly the very dangerous nature of this man's speculations are not sufficiently realized, and parents and those in authority are not duly on the watch against them.

We have run through twelve of Mr. Emerson's Essays, and discovered more of paradox than of truth, and perhaps more of evil than of paradox. Had we looked further, we should have found little or nothing better, though there are two or three happy descriptions of natural scenes in the Essay on Nature: for Mr. Emerson's mind travels round a vicious circle, and is almost incessantly occupied in inculcating self-idolatry. Once more, and

in conclusion, we assure him and his admirers, that the universe is *not* included in that very petty section of it which is reflected on the mirror of his or their individualities. To self-conceit creation seems to have originated in *its* finite perceptions, and to have reached the goal of being when *its* approval is obtained; and nevertheless the world would have gone on very well without it, and will, no doubt, go on, when it shall have been gathered to its fathers. To the mite in the sunshine a ray of light is the universe: nevertheless there *is* a world beyond.—And *his* range of thought must be contracted indeed, his perceptions infinitesimally narrow, who cannot love and reverence his fellow-men as ofttimes equal or superior to himself—who cannot recognise and adore his God.

ART. VIII. — *The Conquest of Canada. By the Author of "Hochelaga."* In 2 vols. 8vo. London: Bentley, 1849.

THOSE who are already acquainted with "Hochelaga" will welcome with pleasure a work by the same author on the same soil; and we can confidently assure them that any pleasurable anticipations which they may form will be fully realized by a perusal of the volumes now before us. They embrace, indeed, not merely the last struggle between France and England for the possession of those vast and interesting territories which lie between the great lake-chain and the Northern Ocean, but contain a full history of Canada, from its first discovery to its final reduction by the arms of Britain, and convey much information regarding the natural productions of the country, and the customs of its aboriginal inhabitants. The author has employed great research, and gives the result in a very attractive form: his style is eloquent, his narrative lucid; and we generally, though not universally, coincide in his views. Having said thus much by way of prelude, we proceed to our vocation, with the certainty of gratifying ourselves, and the hope that we shall gratify our readers, by a rapid sketch of "*The Conquest of Canada.*"

After a very interesting account of all the speculations of the ancients regarding the existence of the Western World, and of those voyages of discovery, either real or imaginary, which preceded the exploit of the great Genoese, Mr. Warburton briefly, but strikingly, touches on the career of Columbus, and then proceeds:—

"It was by accident only that England had been deprived of these great discoveries. Columbus, when repulsed by the courts of Portugal and Spain, sent his brother Bartholomew to London, to lay his projects before Henry VII., and seek assistance for their execution. The king, although the most penurious of European princes, saw the vast advantage of the offer, and invited the great Genoese to his court. Bartholomew was, however, captured by pirates on his return voyage, and detained till too late; for in the mean while Isabella of Castille had adopted the project of Columbus, and supplied the means for the expedition.

"Henry VII. was not discouraged by this disappointment: two years after the discoveries of Columbus became known in England, the king entered into an arrangement with John Cabot, an adventurous

Venetian merchant, resident at Bristol, and on the 5th of March, 1495, granted him letters patent for conquest and discovery. Henry stipulated that one-fifth of the gains in this enterprise was to be retained for the crown, and that the vessels engaged in it should return to the port of Bristol. On the 24th of June, 1497, Cabot discovered the coast of Labrador, and gave it the name of *Primavista.* * * *

* * * * *

"A large island lay opposite this shore: from the vast quantity of fish frequenting the neighbouring waters, the sailors called it *Bacallaos;* Cabot gave this country the name of St. John's, having landed there on St. John's day. Newfoundland has long since superseded both appellations. John Cabot returned to England in August of the same year, and was knighted, and otherwise rewarded by the king; he survived but a very short time in the enjoyment of his fame, and his son Sebastian Cabot, although only twenty-three years of age, succeeded him in the command of an expedition destined to seek a north-west passage to the South Seas.

"Sebastian Cabot sailed in the summer of 1498; he soon reached Newfoundland, and thence proceeded north as far as the fifty-eighth degree. Having failed in discovering the hoped-for passage, he returned towards the south, examining the coast as far as the southern boundary of Maryland, and perhaps Virginia. After a long interval, the enterprising mariner again, in 1517, sailed for America, and entered the bay which a century afterwards received the name of Hudson. If prior discovery confer a right of possession, there is no doubt that the whole eastern coast of the North American continent may be justly claimed by the English race.

"Gasper Cortereal was the next voyager in the succession of discoverers: he had been brought up in the household of the King of Portugal, but nourished an ardent spirit of enterprise and thirst for glory, despite the enervating influences of a court. He sailed early in the year 1500, and pursued the track of John Cabot as far as the northern point of Newfoundland: to him is due the discovery of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and he also pushed on northward by the coast of Labrador, almost to the entrance of Hudson Bay."—vol. i. pp. 27—31.

Portugal and Spain each attempted to explore the northern continent, but with little success and less credit. The expeditions of Cortereal were rather slave-trading ventures than voyages of discovery; whilst those of Ponce de Leon aimed at an imaginary good, and obtained little real benefit. The beautiful coast, which he surnamed Florida, from the richness and variety of its flowers, has passed not only from the crown, but even from the race of Castille:—

"The first attempt made by the French to share in the advantages of these discoveries was in the year 1504. Some Basque and Breton fishermen at that time began to ply their calling on the great bank of

Newfoundland and along the adjacent shores. From them the island of Cape Breton received its name. In 1506, Jean Denys, a man of Harfleur, drew a map of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Two years afterwards, a pilot of Dieppe, named Thomas Aubert, excited great curiosity in France, by bringing over some of the savage natives from the New World: there is no record whence they were taken, but it is supposed from Cape Breton. The reports borne back to France by these hardy fishermen and adventurers were not such as to raise sanguine hopes of riches from the bleak northern regions they had visited: no teeming fertility or genial climate tempted the settler, no mines of gold or silver excited the avarice of the soldier, and for many years the French altogether neglected to profit by their discoveries."—p. 34.

The decree by which that disgrace to humanity, Alexander the Sixth, divided the western hemisphere between the crowns of Castille and Portugal, impeded, though it did not suppress, the maritime discoveries of other nations. It was not long ere the Reformation, by denying the authority, destroyed the effect of the papal bull as far as regarded England; and France, though adhering to the communion of Rome, showed an early determination to dispute the Borgia grant:—

"In the year 1523, Francis I. fitted out a squadron of four ships to pursue discovery in the west; the command was intrusted to Giovanni Verazzano of Florence, a navigator of great skill and experience, then residing in France: he was about thirty-eight years of age, nobly born, and liberally educated; the causes that induced him to leave his own country and take service in France are not known. It has often been remarked as strange, that three Italians should have directed the discoveries of Spain, England, and France, and thus become the instruments of dividing the dominions of the New World among alien powers, while their own classic land reaped neither glory nor advantage from the genius and courage of her sons. Of this first voyage the only record remaining is a letter from Verazzano to Francis I., dated 8th of July, 1524, merely stating that he had returned in safety to Dieppe.

"At the beginning of the following year Verazzano fitted out and armed a vessel called the Dauphine, manned with a crew of thirty hands, and provisioned for eight months. He first directed his course to Madeira; having reached that island in safety, he left it on the 17th of January, and steered for the west. After a narrow escape from the violence of a tempest, and having proceeded for about nine hundred leagues, a long low line of coast rose to view, never before seen by ancient or modern navigators. This country appeared thickly peopled by a vigorous race, of tall stature and athletic form: fearing to risk a landing at first with his weak force, the adventurer contented himself with admiring at a distance the grandeur and beauty of the scenery, and enjoying the delightful mildness of the climate. From this place he followed the coast for about fifty leagues to the south, without dis-

covering any harbour or inlet where he might shelter his vessel; he then retraced his course, and steered to the north. After some time Verazzano ventured to send a small boat on shore to examine the country more closely: numbers of savages came to the water's edge to meet the strangers, and gazed on them with mingled feelings of surprise, admiration, joy, and fear. He again resumed his northward course, till, driven by want of water, he armed the small boat, and sent it once more towards the land to seek a supply; the waves and surf, however, were so great, that it could not reach the shore. The natives, assembled on the beach, by their signs and gestures eagerly invited the French to approach: one young sailor, a bold swimmer, threw himself into the water, bearing some presents for the savages, but his heart failed him on a nearer approach, and he turned to regain the boat; his strength was exhausted, however, and a heavy sea washed him almost insensible up upon the beach. The Indians treated him with great kindness, and, when he had sufficiently recovered, sent him back in safety to the ship.

"Verazzano pursued his examination of the coast with untiring zeal, narrowly searching every inlet for a passage through to the westward, until he reached the great island, known to the Breton fishermen, Newfoundland. In this important voyage he surveyed more than two thousand miles of coast, nearly all that of the present United States, and a great portion of British North America."—p. 37.

Another expedition under the same commander was devoid of any result. In 1525 Stefano Gomez sailed from Spain for Cuba and Florida, whence, coasting northwards, he reached Cape Race on the south-eastern coast of Newfoundland. His object in steering to the north was to discover the north-west passage to India,—that fatal mirage which has lured so many noble spirits across the shifting desert of the barren sea to fail and to perish. The other delusions of early times have left us. The philosopher's stone no longer excites the ambition of our scholars and chemists; our mechanics no longer attempt to produce perpetual motion in perishable things; the ancien régime, with all its faults and follies, has passed away for ever; and popery has, generally speaking, lost all hold either upon the heart or the head of the educated classes on the European continent. But the north-west passage still remains a monument of past ignorance and present perversity, like a hoar-headed barbarian, who (the last of his own generation) yet survives to tell the tale of the past to his civilized descendants.

How far Gomez penetrated is unknown; but there is reason to believe that he entered the estuary of the St. Lawrence, and traded on its banks. A Spanish tradition asserts, that the Spaniards reached these shores before the French, and, disappointed with finding no symptoms of gold or silver mines,

repeatedly cried out "*ca nada!*" *here* (*there is*) *nothing;* whence the name Canada. This, however, is evidently one of those punning derivations by which ingenious idlers attempt to account for names with the origin of which they are unacquainted. The word Kannata or Kannada signifies village, or a collection of Indian cabins, in the dialect of several of the tribes which inhabited the shores of the Gulf of St. Lawrence when the French arrived there, and it is clear the name Canada arose from a misconception of the strangers, who, whenever they asked the name of an inhabited spot, received for answer a word which they supposed to denote the whole country.

"In the year 1534, Philip Chabot, admiral of France, urged the king to establish a colony in the New World, by representing to him in glowing colours the great riches and power derived by the Spaniards from their transatlantic possessions. Francis I., alive to the importance of the design, soon agreed to carry it out. Jacques Cartier, an experienced navigator of St. Malo, was recommended by the admiral to be intrusted with the expedition, and was approved of by the king. On the 20th of April, 1534, Cartier sailed from St. Malo with two ships of only sixty tons' burthen each, and 120 men for their crews. He directed his course westward, inclining rather to the north; the winds proved so favourable, that on the twentieth day of the voyage he had made Cape Bonavista in Newfoundland. But the harbours of that dreary country were still locked up in the winter's ice, forbidding the approach of shipping; he then bent to the south-east, and at length found anchorage at St. Catherine, six degrees lower in latitude. Having remained here ten days, he again turned to the north, and on the 21st of May reached Bird Island, fourteen leagues from the coast.

"Jacques Cartier examined all the northern shores of Newfoundland without having ascertained that it was an island, and then passed southward through the Straits of Belleisle. The country appeared every where the same bleak and inhospitable wilderness; but the harbours were numerous, convenient, and abounding in fish. He describes the natives as well-proportioned men, wearing their hair tied up over their heads, like bundles of hay, quaintly interlaced with birds' feathers. Changing his course still more to the south, he then traversed the Gulf of St. Lawrence, approached the main land, and on the 9th of July entered a deep bay; from the intense heat experienced there, he named it the 'Baye de Chaleurs.' The beauty of the country, and the kindness and hospitality of his reception, alike charmed him; he carried on a little trade with the friendly savages, exchanging European goods for their furs and provisions.

"Leaving this bay, Jacques Cartier visited a considerable extent of the gulf-coast; on the 24th of July he erected a cross thirty feet high, with a shield bearing the fleur-de-lys of France on the shore of Gaspi Bay. Having thus taken possession of the country for his king in the usual manner of those days, he sailed on the 25th of July on his home-

ward voyage. At this place two of the natives were seized by stratagem, carried on board the ships, and borne away to France. Cartier coasted along the northern shores of the gulf the 15th of August, and even entered the mouth of the River St. Lawrence, but, the weather becoming stormy, he determined to delay his departure no longer: he passed again through the Straits of Belleisle, and arrived at St. Malo on the 5th of September, 1534, contented with his success, and full of hope for the future.

"Jacques Cartier was received with the consideration due to the importance of his report. The Court at once perceived the advantage of an establishment in this part of America, and resolved to take steps for its foundation. Charles de Moncy, Sieur de la Mailleray, vice-admiral of France, was the most active patron of the undertaking; through his influence Cartier obtained a more effective force, and a new commission, with ampler powers than before. When the preparations for the voyage were completed, the adventurers all assembled in the cathedral of St. Malo, on Whit-Sunday, 1535, by the command of their pious leader; the bishop then gave them a solemn benediction, with all the imposing ceremonials of the Romish Church."—p. 45.

On the 19th of May, Cartier again set sail, his fleet consisting of three small vessels, the largest being not more than 120 tons' burthen. Separated by storms from each other, they all made for Newfoundland, where the leader's vessel arrived first, on the 7th of July. On the 26th her consorts joined her. We proceed in Mr. Warburton's own glowing language; for to abridge in such a case would be unpardonable.

"Having taken in supplies of fuel and water, they sailed in company to explore the Gulf of St. Lawrence. A violent storm arose on the 1st of August, forcing them to seek shelter. They happily found a port on the north shore, at the entrance of the Great River, where, though difficult of access, there was a safe anchorage. Jacques Cartier called it St. Nicholas, and it is now almost the only place still bearing the name he gave. They left their harbour on the 7th, coasting westward along the north shore, and on the 10th came to a gulf filled with numerous and beautiful islands. Cartier gave this gulf the name of St. Lawrence, having discovered it on that Saint's festival day. On the 15th of August, they reached a long rocky island toward the south, which Cartier named l'Isle de l'Assumption, now called Anticosti. Thence they continued their course, examining carefully both shores of the Great River, and occasionally holding communication with the inhabitants, till, on the 1st of September, they entered the mouth of the deep and gloomy Saguenay. The entrance of this great tributary was all they had leisure to survey; but the huge rocks, dense forests, and vast body of water, forming a scene of sombre magnificence such as had never before met their view, inspired them with an exalted idea of the country they had discovered. Still passing to the south-west of the

St. Lawrence, on the 6th they reached an island abounding in delicious filberts, and on that account named by the voyagers Isle aux Coudres. Cartier, being now so far advanced into an unknown country, looked out anxiously for a port where his vessels might winter in safety. He pursued his voyage till he came upon another island, of great extent, fertility, and beauty, covered with woods and thick-clustering vines. This he named Isle de Bacchus : it is now called Orleans. On the 7th of September, Donnacona, the chief of the country, came, with twelve canoes filled by his train, to hold converse with the strangers, whose ships lay at anchor between the island and the north shore of the Great River. The Indian chief approached the smallest of the ships with only two canoes, fearful of causing alarm, and began an oration, accompanied with strange and uncouth gestures. After a time he conversed with the Indians who had been seized on the former voyage, and now acted as interpreters. He heard from them of their wonderful visit to the great nation over the salt lake, of the wisdom and power of the white men, and of the kind treatment they had received among the strangers. Donnacona appeared moved with deep respect and admiration ; he took Jacques Cartier's arm, and placed it gently over his own bended neck, in token of confidence and regard. The admiral cordially returned these friendly demonstrations. He entered the Indians' canoe, and presented bread and wine, which they ate and drank together. They then parted in all amity.

" After this happy interview, Jacques Cartier with his boats pushed up the north shore against the stream, till he reached a spot where a little river flowed into a 'goodly and pleasant sound,' forming a convenient haven. He moored his vessels here for the winter on the 18th of September, and gave the name of St. Croix to the stream, in honour of the day on which he first entered its waters : Donnacona, accompanied by a train of 500 Indians, came to welcome his arrival with generous friendship. In the angle formed by the tributary stream and the Great River stood the town of Stadacona, the dwelling-place of the chief; thence an irregular slope ascended to a lofty height of table-land : from this eminence a bold headland frowned over the St. Lawrence, forming a rocky wall 300 feet in height. The waters of the Great River, here narrowed to less than a mile in breadth, rolled deeply and rapidly past into the broad basin beyond. When the white men first stood on the summit of this bold headland, above their port of shelter, most of the country was fresh from the hand of the Creator ; save the three small barks lying at the mouth of the stream, and the Indian village, no sign of human habitations met their view. Far as the eye could reach, the dark forest spread : over hill and valley, mountain and plain ; up to the craggy peaks, down to the blue water's edge ; along the gentle slopes of the rich Isle of Bacchus, and even from projecting rocks, and in fissures of the lofty precipice, the deep green mantle of the summer foliage hung its graceful folds. In the dim distance, north, south, east, and west, where mountain rose above mountain in tumultuous variety of outline, it was still the same ;

one vast leafy veil concealed the virgin face of nature from the stranger's sight. On the eminence commanding this scene of wild but magnificent beauty a prosperous city now stands: the patient industry of man has felled that dense forest, tree by tree, for miles and miles around; and where it stood, rich fields rejoice the eye; the once silent waters of the Great River below now surge against hundreds of stately ships; commerce has enriched this spot; art adorned it; a memory of glory endears it to every British heart. But the name QUEBEC still remains unchanged; as the savage first pronounced it to the white stranger, it stands to-day among the proudest records of our country's story."—pp. 42—53.

Proud indeed is the sound of that name to England, and in the pride that it awakens there is nothing to gall or wound our defeated adversaries. The conquest of Canada, the capture of Quebec were achieved by British valour, not yielded by French cowardice. The conduct indeed of our opponents on the occasion was such as to raise the merit of our success to the highest attainable point, whilst the courage and skill of the conqueror was such as to make even defeat itself honourable. But we are anticipating. Let us return to that period when the white intruder, of whatever nation, was a stranger in the home of the native Canadian.

"The chief Donnacona and the French continued in friendly intercourse, day by day exchanging good offices and tokens of regard. But Jacques Cartier was eager for further discoveries: the two Indian interpreters told him that a city of much larger size than Stadacona lay further up the river, the capital of a great country: it was called in the native tongue Hochelaga; thither he resolved to find his way. The Indians endeavoured vainly to dissuade their dangerous guests from this expedition: they represented the distance, the lateness of the season, the danger of the great lakes and rapid currents; at length they had recourse to a kind of masquerade or pantomime, to represent the perils of the voyage, and the ferocity of the tribes inhabiting that distant land. The interpreters earnestly strove to dissuade Jacques Cartier from proceeding on his enterprise, and one of them refused to accompany him. The brave Frenchman would not hearken to such dissuasions, and treated with equal contempt the verbal and pantomimic warnings of the alleged difficulties. As a precautionary measure to impress the savages with an exalted idea of his power as a friend or foe, he caused twelve cannon loaded with bullets to be fired in their presence against a wood: amazed and terrified at the noise, and the effect of this discharge, they fled howling and shrieking away. Jacques Cartier sailed for Hochelaga on the 19th of September. . . The voyage presented few of the threatened difficulties; the country on both sides of the Great River was rich and varied, covered with stately timber, and abounding in vines. . . . The place where the French first

landed was, probably, about eleven miles from the city of Hochelaga, below the rapid of St. Mary. On the day after his arrival Jacques Cartier proceeded to the town. . . . The road was well beaten, and bore evidence of being much frequented; the country through which it passed was exceedingly rich and fertile. Hochelaga stood in the midst of great fields of Indian corn; it was of a circular form, containing about fifty large huts, each fifty paces long, and from fourteen to fifteen wide, all built in the shape of tunnels, formed of wood, and covered with birch bark; the dwellings were divided into several rooms, surrounding an open court in the centre, where the fires burned. Three rows of palisades encircled the town, with only one entrance; above the gate, and over the whole length of the outer ring of defence, there was a gallery, approached by flights of steps, and plentifully provided with stones and other missiles to resist attack. This was a place of considerable importance in those remote days, as the capital of a great extent of country, and as having eight or ten villages subject to its sway. The inhabitants spoke the language of the great Huron nation, and were more advanced in civilization than any of their neighbours; unlike other tribes, they cultivated the ground, and remained stationary. . . . Three miles from Hochelaga, there was a lofty hill, well tilled and very fertile; thither Jacques Cartier bent his way after having examined the town. From the summit he saw the river and the country for thirty leagues around, a scene of singular beauty. To this hill he gave the name of Mont Royal, since extended to the large and fertile island on which it stands, and to the city below. Time has now swept away all trace of Hochelaga: on its site the modern capital of Canada has arisen; 50,000 people of European race, and stately buildings of carved stone, replace the simple Indians and the huts of the ancient towns."—vol. i. p. 58.

The destruction of the ancient town, however, does not lie at the door of the French settlers. In fact, the tale of its ruin is unknown. After a time it vanishes from history without remark. It ceases to be mentioned for a while, and then, when inquired after, is found no longer in existence.

Jacques Cartier returned safe to France, carrying with him the chief Donnacona, whom he had treacherously entrapped, having unjustly suspected him of sinister designs. The prisoner was, however, soon reconciled to his fate by the kind treatment and great distinction which he experienced. But his death in France raised suspicions in the minds of his countrymen, which, though carefully concealed, destroyed for ever their confidence in the French.

To trace the fortunes of the French adventurers and the colony which they founded, from the departure of Jacques Cartier on his first voyage, to the capture of Quebec by the British in 1629, would be a tedious and unprofitable task. Such narratives lose

all interest when stripped of their details. It is painful as well as tiresome to read of a series of mistakes and mishaps, of domestic quarrels, party contests, and petty wars, when deprived of those striking facts and heroic exploits which alone render such subjects bearable. This portion of his work has been admirably executed by the author. He has indeed contrived to throw a charm over the incidents of a border struggle, and to give a wholesome interest to the minutiæ of a court intrigue. One circumstance strikes us as worthy of remark. The French Huguenots were anxious to have made Canada their refuge, but their intention was frustrated by the jealousy of Romanism. It were vain as endless to speculate on the possible consequences of this desire, had it been carried out.

But let us return to our narrative :—

"When the French received the news of the loss of Canada, opinion was much divided as to the wisdom of seeking to regain the captured settlement. Some thought its possession of little value in proportion to the expense it caused; while others deemed that the fur-trade and fisheries were of great importance to the commerce of France, as well as a useful nursery of experienced seamen. Champlain strongly urged the government not to give up a country where they had already overcome the principal difficulties of settlement, and where, through their means, the light of religion was dawning upon the darkness of heathen ignorance. His solicitations were successful, and Canada was restored to France at the same time with Acadia and Cape Breton, by the treaty of St. Germain-en-Laye. At this period," proceeds our author, "the fort of Quebec, surrounded by a score of hastily-built dwellings and barracks, some poor huts on the island of Montreal, the like at Three Rivers and Tadoussac, and a few fishermen's log-houses elsewhere on the banks of the St. Lawrence, were the only fruits of the discoveries of Verazzano, Jacques Cartier, Roberval, and Champlain, the great outlay of La Roche and De Monts, and the toils and sufferings of their followers, for nearly a century."—p. 99.

We have no space to afford a due eulogium to the great and good Champlain, who stamped the first permanent impression upon New France. His name will ever be gratefully remembered in the land of his adoption, and honoured by all good men throughout the world. He died in December, 1635[1]. And now commences

[1] In the same month, to the deep regret of all good men, death deprived his country of the brave, high-minded, and wise Champlain. He was buried in the city of which he was the founder; where, to this day, he is fondly and gratefully remembered among the just and good. Gifted with high ability, upright, active, and chivalrous, he was at the same time eminent for his Christian zeal and humble piety. "The salvation of one soul," he often said, "is of more value than the conquest of an empire."—p. 101.

the regular history of Canada, and here the author pauses to review the character and condition of the country when it became the abode of a race of European extraction. His account of the physical phenomena, general appearance, and natural productions of the country, with the manners and customs of its inhabitants, is extremely entertaining, though to some of our readers portions will probably be already familiar, and some of the results arrived at may perhaps admit of question. There is, however, a racy vigour and a rude eloquence in this part of the work which well accord with the subject. After occupying five chapters with these interesting subjects, our author devotes three more to the history of the British settlements, and then takes up the thread of his narrative again, saying:—

"Having noticed the principal features of the origin and progress of the English colonies, the powerful and dangerous neighbours of the French settlement, in the New World, it is now time to return to the course of Canadian history subsequent to the death of the illustrious founder of Quebec."

Long and fierce was the struggle between the rival nations, embittered by hereditary animosity, and sharpened by the love of gain as well as that of glory and power. The accession of Indian allies on either side gave a ferocity to the warfare hitherto unknown in the contest waged between England and France—a ferocity which spread from the barbarians to the colonists, and even infected the European commanders. Much was the suffering inflicted, many were the atrocities perpetrated on either side; and it was a happy result for both peoples which terminated the internecine hostility of New France and New England by placing them both under British rule. Strange that the victory which gave us the one deprived us of the other—strange that the success of Wolfe laid the foundation of the defeat of England—strange that the overthrow of Montcalm prepared the way for the triumph of France! That such, however, was the case, there can be no doubt. Let us, however, proceed.

"By the treaty of Utrecht in 1713, Louis the Magnificent ceded away for ever, with ignorant indifference, the noble province of Acadia, the inexhaustible fisheries of Newfoundland, and his claims to the vast but almost unknown regions of Hudson's Bay; his nominal sovereignty over the Iroquois was also thrown into the scale, and thus a dearly purchased peace restored comparative tranquillity to the remnant of his American empire."—vol. ii. p. 13.

More than thirty years afterwards the then Governor of Canada—

"The Comte de la Gallisonière proposed that Monsieur du Quesne, a skilful engineer, should be appointed to establish a line of fortifications through the interior of the country, and at the same time urged the Government of France to send out 10,000 peasants to form settlements on the banks of the great lakes and southern rivers. By these means he affirmed that the English colonies would be restricted within the narrow tract lying eastward from the Alleghany Mountains, and in time laid open to invasion and ruin. His advice was, however, disregarded, and the splendid province of Canada soon passed for ever from under the sway of France."—vol. ii. p. 25.

"In the year 1750, commissioners met at Paris to adjust the various boundaries of the North American territories. . . . The English commissioners, however, soon perceived that there was little chance of arriving at a friendly arrangement. The more they advanced in their offers, the more the French demanded; futile objections were started, and unnecessary delays continued: at length Mr. Shirley and his colleague broke up the conference, and returned to England. It now became evident that a decisive struggle was at hand."—vol. ii. p. 33.

After a long and doubtful contest, in which success alternated between the rival powers, the scale became turned completely in favour of France, till at length the genius of Montcalm and the inefficiency of his antagonists seemed likely to subjugate the whole continent to the sway of the house of Bourbon. It was not until the great Earl of Chatham was securely established as Prime Minister of England that success once more attended the arms of our countrymen.

"This illustrious man knew no party but the British nation, acknowledged no other interest. To exalt the power and prosperity of his country and to humble France was his sole aim and object. Personally disagreeable to the highest power in the state, and from many causes regarded with hostility by the several aristocratic confederacies, it needed the almost unanimous voice of his countrymen, and the acknowledged confidence of those powerful men whose favour he neither possessed nor desired, to sweep away those formidable difficulties, and give to England in the hour of need the services of her greatest son.

"For the remainder of the campaign of 1757, however, the energy and wisdom of Pitt were too late brought to the council, and the ill-conducted schemes of his predecessors bore, as has been shown, the bitter fruit of disaster and disgrace. But no sooner was he firmly established in office, and his plans put in execution, than the British cause began to revive in the western hemisphere, and, although still chequered with defeat, glory and success rewarded his gigantic efforts. He at once determined to renew the expedition against Cape Breton, and, warned by previous failures, urged upon the king the necessity of removing both the naval and military officers who had hitherto conducted the operations. With that admirable perception, which is one of the

most useful faculties of superior minds, he readily discerned in others the qualities requisite for his purpose,—his judgment ever unwarped, and his keen vision unclouded by personal or political considerations. In Colonel Amherst he had discovered sound sense, steady courage, and an active genius; he, therefore, recalled him from the army in Germany, and, casting aside the hampering formalities of military rule, promoted him to the rank of Major-general, and the command of the troops destined for the attack of Louisburgh. At the same time, from the British Navy's brilliant roll the minister selected the Hon. Edward Boscawen as admiral of the fleet, and gave him also, till the arrival of General Amherst, the unusual commission of command over the land forces. With vigorous zeal the equipments were hurried on, and, on the 19th of February, a magnificent armament sailed from Portsmouth for the harbour of Halifax on the Acadian peninsula. The general was delayed by contrary winds, and did not reach Halifax till the 28th of May, where he met Boscawen's fleet coming out of the harbour; the admiral, impatient of delay, having put all the force in motion, with the exception of a corps 1600 strong, left to guard the post. No less than twenty-two ships of the line and fifteen frigates, with 120 smaller vessels, sailed under his flag, and fourteen battalions of infantry with artillery and engineers, in all 11,600, almost exclusively British regulars, were embarked to form the army of General Amherst. The troops were told off in three brigades of nearly equal strength, under the Brigadier-generals Whitmore, Lawrence, and JAMES WOLFE."—vol. ii. pp. 133—35.

We have already given so many extracts from the earlier portions of the work, that the limits which we have assigned to this article prevent us from giving any lengthened account of the operations which ended in the conquest of Canada, and the final triumph of the Anglo-Saxon race on the North American continent. Dangers and difficulties of the most appalling description were overpowered by the skill and courage of Amherst and Wolfe; nor did the genius and valour of Montcalm, or the inefficiency of their own coadjutors, prevent the triumph which their supereminent merit forced from the hands of the gallant enemy.

The first exploit of the English was the capture of Louisburgh, bravely defended by Drucour. The account of the siege is most spirited and graphic. We have only room for the concluding observations.

"In those days the taking of Louisburgh was a mighty triumph for the British arms: a place of considerable strength, defended with skill and courage, fully manned and aided by a powerful fleet, had been bravely won; 5000 men, soldiers, sailors, and mariners, were prisoners; eleven ships of war taken or destroyed, 240 pieces of ordnance, 15,000 stand of arms, and a great amount of ammunition, provisions and military stores, had fallen into the hands of the victors, and eleven

stand of colours were laid at the feet of the British sovereign; they were afterwards solemnly deposited in St. Paul's Cathedral.

But, while the wisdom and zeal of Amherst and the daring skill of Wolfe excite the gratitude and admiration of their countrymen, it must not be forgotten that causes beyond the power and patriotism of man mainly influenced this great event. The brave admiral doubted the practicability of the first landing. Amherst hesitated, and the chivalrous Wolfe himself, as he neared the awful surf, staggered in his resolution, and, purposing to defer the enterprise, waved his hat for the boats to retire. Three young subaltern officers, however, commanding the leading craft, pushed on ashore, having mistaken the signal for what their stout hearts desired, the order to advance; some of their men, as they sprung upon the beach, were dragged back by the receding surge and drowned, but the remainder climbed up the rugged rocks, and formed upon the summit. The brigadier then cheered on the rest of the divisions to the support of this gallant few, and thus the almost desperate landing was accomplished.

"Nor should due record be omitted of that which enhances the glory of the conquerors, and the merit of the conquered. To defend the whole line of coast with his garrison was impossible; for nearly eight miles, however, the energetic Drucour had thrown up a chain of works, and occupied salient points with troops. And when, at length, the besiegers effected a landing, he still left no means untried to uphold the honour of his flag. Hope of relief or succour there was none; beyond the waters of the bay the sea was white with the sails of the hostile fleet. Around him on every side the long red line of the British infantry closed in from day to day. His light troops were swept from the neighbouring woods; his sallies were interrupted or overwhelmed; well-armed batteries were pushed up to the very ramparts; a murderous fire of musketry struck down his gunners at their work; three gaping breaches lay open to the assailants; his best ships burned or taken; his officers and men worn with fatigue and watching; four-fifths of his artillery disabled; then, and not till then, did the brave Frenchman give up the trust which he had nobly and faithfully held. To the honour of the garrison, not a man deserted his colours, through all the dangers, privations, and hardships of the siege, with the exception of a few Germans, who served as unwilling conscripts. This spirited defence was in so far successful, that it occupied the bulk of the British force, while Abercromby was being crushed by the superior genius and power of Montcalm; by thus delaying for seven weeks the progress of the campaign, the season became too far advanced for further operations, and the final catastrophe of French American dominion was deferred for another year."—vol. ii. pp. 140—143.

In the spring of 1759 every preparation was made by the British to ensure the entire conquest of Canada, which had now become the darling object both of the Minister and the nation. It is painful to look back on the cruelties perpetrated throughout

this war by both the parties engaged in it, though the balance of humanity is strongly on the side of the English, and no charge of bad faith can be brought against our countrymen.

"The general's active care could not protect the frontier settlers from the atrocious cruelties of the French and Indians; although scouting parties were constantly moving through the forests, the subtle and ferocious enemy eluded their vigilance, and scalped men, women, and children without mercy. These outrages gave rise to the following order by Amherst, which he found means to forward to the governor of Canada and his general:—

"'No scouting party, or others in the army, are to scalp women or children belonging to the enemy. They are, if possible, to take them prisoners, but not to injure them on any account, the general being determined, should the enemy continue to murder and scalp women and children who are the subjects of the King of Great Britain, to revenge it by the death of two men of the enemy for every woman or child murdered by them.'

"It were a needless pain to dwell upon the cruelties of this bloody war. Our countrymen must bear their share, although not an equal share, of the deep disgrace. The contending parties readily acquired the fiendish ingenuity in torture of their Indian allies; the Frenchman soon became as expert as his Red teacher in tearing the scalp from a prostrate enemy; and even the British soldier counted those odious trophies with unnatural triumph. In the exterminating strife, the thirst of blood became strong and deep, and was slaked, not only in the life-streams of the armed foe, but in that of the aged, the maimed, the helpless woman, and the innocent child. The peaceful hamlet and the smiling corn-field excited hostile fury alike with the camp, the intrenchment, and the fort, and shared in their destruction when the defenders were overpowered. Yet, still over these murdered corpses and scenes of useless desolation the spotless flag of France and the Red Cross of St. George waved in alternate triumph, proudly and remorselessly, by their symbolic presence sanctioning the disgraceful strife."—vol. ii. p. 241.

It is with pleasure that we leave this painful subject to give some of the outlines of that great achievement which forms the climax of the interesting narrative before us—great in every sense, whether we consider the chivalrous commander and his gallant army, or the mighty results which have thence arisen. Well might the great minister pour forth the full tide of his overwhelming eloquence as he spoke of "the horror of the night, the precipice scaled by Wolfe, the empire he with a handful of men had added to England, and the glorious catastrophe of contentedly terminating his life when his fame began." Well might he declare that "ancient story may be ransacked, and ostentatious

philosophy thrown into the account before an episode can be found to rank with Wolfe's."

The whole wondrous narrative is here told in a manner to give full effect to every incident. It is like some mighty picture, so true to life and nature, that we see the shades of night gathering, we hear the almost silent plash of the stealthy oar, we mark the troops as one by one they gain the rough ascent, we see the terrified courier as he scuds over the plains of Abraham, and gives the deadly intelligence to the brave, the talented, the merciless Montcalm. For a moment we share in his concealed distress, till the memory of the many atrocities which he encouraged or permitted removes all sympathy from our minds, and we exclaim, "No pity for the pitiless!"

It would seem as if Montcalm had for the moment been preternaturally urged upon his destruction. "Once, and once only, in a successful and illustrious career, did this gallant Frenchman forget his wisdom and military skill; but that one tremendous error led him to defeat and death." Had he remained within the shelter of the fortifications of Quebec, winter would soon have forced the English to retire from before its walls, for Wolfe's force was (without the assistance of Amherst, who was still far distant) quite unequal to reducing the city so strongly garrisoned and defended, especially in the brief interval before the severe season set in. In this case the fall of Quebec must have been delayed till next year; and in the meanwhile a change might have occurred in European affairs, or France might have been enabled to send efficient succours. Despite of all these considerations, and after having only a short time before recorded his deliberate opinion that he could not face the British army in a general engagement, he now on an open plain, without waiting even for his artillery, led his troops, a great portion of which consisted of the rude Canadian Militia, against the veterans of England. We extract a few passages describing the results. After some movements on both sides:—

"The whole of the French centre and left, with loud shouts and arms at the recover now bore down to the attack. Their right troops then ceased firing, and passed to the rear. As the view cleared, their long unbroken lines, were seen rapidly approaching Wolfe's position. When they reached within 150 yards, they advanced obliquely from the left of each formation, so that the lines assumed the appearance of columns, and chiefly threatened the British right. And now from flank to flank of the assailing battalions rolled a murderous and incessant fire. The 35th and the Grenadiers fell fast. Wolfe, at the head of the 28th, was struck on the wrist, but not disabled. Wrapping a handkerchief round the wound, he hastened from one rank to another, ex-

horting the men to be steady and to reserve their fire. No English soldier pulled a trigger; with matchless endurance they sustained the trial. Not a company wavered: their arms shouldered, as if on parade, and motionless, save when they closed up the ghastly gaps, they waited the word of command. When the head of the French attack had reached within forty yards, Wolfe gave the order to fire. At once the long row of muskets was levelled, and a volley distinct as a single shot flashed from the British line. For a moment the advancing columns still pressed on, shivering like pennons in the fatal storm; but a few paces told how terrible had been the force of the long-suspended blow. Numbers of the French soldiers reeled and fell; some staggered on for a little, then dropped silently aside to die; others burst from the ranks shrieking in agony. The Brigadier de St. Ours was struck dead, and De Senezergues, the second in command, was left mortally wounded on the field. When the breeze carried away the dense clouds of smoke, the assailing battalions stood reduced to mere groups among the bodies of the slain. Never before or since has a deadlier volley burst from British infantry. Montcalm commanded the attack in person. Not fifteen minutes had elapsed since he had first moved on his line of battle, and already all was lost. The Canadian militia, with scarcely an exception, broke and fled. The right wing, which had recoiled before Townshend and Howe, was overpowered by a counter attack of the 58th and 78th: his veteran battalions of Berne and Guienne were shattered before his eyes under the British fire; on the left the royal Rousillon was shrunk to a mere skeleton, and deserted by their provincial allies, could hardly retain the semblance of a formation. But the gallant Frenchman, though ruined, was not dismayed: he rode through the broken ranks, cheered them with his voice, encouraged them by his dauntless bearing, and, aided by a small redoubt, succeeded in once again presenting a front to the enemy.

"Meanwhile Wolfe's troops had reloaded. He seized the opportunity of the hesitation in the hostile ranks, and ordered the whole British line to advance. At first they moved with majestic regularity, receiving and paying back with deadly interest the volleys of the French. But soon the ardour of the soldiers broke through the restraint of discipline, and they increased their pace to a run, rushing over the dying and the dead, and sweeping the living enemy off their path . . . . . Just now Wolfe was a second time wounded in the body, but he dissembled his sufferings, for his duty was not yet accomplished; again a ball from the redoubt struck him on the breast: he reeled on one side, but at the moment this was not generally observed. 'Support me,' said he to a grenadier officer close at hand, 'that my brave fellows may not see me fall.' In a few seconds, however, he sank, and was borne a little to the rear."—vol. ii. p. 344.

But a sadder task remains to be performed—if indeed a death so heroic, so glorious as that of Wolfe can be deemed sad. We

know of no subject more noble, and have never seen any more nobly treated.

"While the British troops were carrying all before them, their young general's life was ebbing fast away. When struck for the third time, he sank down; he then supported himself for a few minutes in a sitting posture, with the assistance of Lieutenant Brown, Mr. Henderson, a volunteer, and a private soldier, all of the grenadier company of the 22nd; Colonel Williamson of the Royal Artillery afterwards went to his aid. From time to time Wolfe tried with his faint hand to clear away the death-mist that gathered on his sight; but the effect seemed vain; for presently he lay back, and gave no signs of life beyond a heavy breathing and an occasional groan. Meantime the French had given way, and were flying in all directions. The grenadier officers, seeing this, called out to those around him, 'See, they run.' The words caught the ear of the dying man; he raised himself like one aroused from sleep, and asked, eagerly, 'Who runs?' 'The enemy, Sir,' answered the officer; 'they give way every where.' 'Go one of you to Colonel Burton,' said Wolfe, 'tell him to march *Webbe's* (the 48th) regiment with all speed down to the St. Charles River, to cut off the retreat.' His voice grew faint as he spoke, and he turned as if seeking an easier position on his side; when he had given this last order, he seemed to feel that he had done his duty, and added, feebly but distinctly, 'Now, God be praised, I die happy.' His eyes then closed; and, after a few convulsive movements, he became still. Despite the anguish of his wounds, he died happy, for, through the mortal shades that fell upon his soul, there rose over the unknown world's horizon the dawn of an eternal morning.

Art. IX.—*The Holy City. Historical, Topographical, and Antiquarian Notices of Jerusalem. By* George Williams, *B.D., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. The Second Edition, with Additions, including an Architectural History of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. By the Rev.* R. Willis, *M.A., Jacksonian Professor in the University of Cambridge.* 2 vols. London: J. W. Parker. 1849.

The difficulty of comprehending much of the sacred narrative, owing to our very imperfect knowledge of the geography of the Holy Land, is notorious. And though the last few years have given birth to many attempts at removing this, their success—it may be fearlessly asserted—has not been commensurate with either the efforts or the pretensions of their authors. It is pretty generally acknowledged by those acquainted with the subject, that too implicit a confidence has been reposed both in the Map of D'Anville and in the Travels of Dr. Clarke. More lately the Scotch Dr. Wilson and the American Dr. Robinson have laboured in the same field; but not with the success which could have been desired. Nor has the most interesting spot of the whole country, the Holy City, fared better than the rest of Palestine. Many have been the attempts to "restore" it,—to gather from its present chorographical aspect a consistent idea of the ancient city, and to mark the sites of those localities which must ever be invested, in the mind of the Christian, with awe and veneration. But, what with building upon insufficient data, or striving to support some pre-conceived theory, no writer that we have met with has succeeded in disentangling the many difficulties which have confessedly beset the subject, and in laying before the world an account consistent with history and probability.

In this we are much inclined to think that Mr. Williams has far outstripped all his competitors. Learned and intelligent, he has not wasted the time which he spent in this cradle of Christianity. His object appears to be a simple investigation of the truth; and to this he has applied himself, unencumbered by any previously contracted theories, and wise enough—circumstances compel us to add, bold enough—to reverence the ancient traditions of Jeru-

salem. This, indeed, we will fairly acknowledge, appears to us to be the great folly, the threshold stumbling-block with many both of those who have laboured in this department, and of others who have criticized their works. If it be (and who can gainsay this?) an acknowledged principle, that local traditions are of prime service and of principal authority in every archæological investigation, why, in the name of common sense, are they to be ignored or scouted, when such investigation is applied to the spot in the whole earth, where traditions from the earliest date would be most likely to be preserved with pious care, and where (unless we be much mistaken) they do agree with remarkable uniformity? We do not, indeed, profess to declare the differences between Mr. Williams and other travellers, Dr. Robinson in particular, to be finally and satisfactorily adjusted; this would imply a minute and lengthy examination. But this much we hesitate not at once to avouch—a strong predilection in favour of inductions grounded upon, and in the main consentaneous with, traditions of a hoar antiquity, and the assertions of such men as Eusebius and Cyril; and we are so fully impressed with the value of this very interesting book, as a whole, that we cannot delay to call to it the attention of our readers.

The first volume contains what may be called the *historical* portion; the second treats of *topographical* and *antiquarian* matters. In the former we have a succinct history, chronologically arranged, after the system of Prideaux, of the Jewish nation from the supposed foundation of the Holy City by Melchizedec down to the death of Herod the Great; thence to the defeat of the Persians by Heraclius, A. D. 629; and then follow two chapters, the headings of which are, respectively, "*Jerusalem under the Saracens*," and, "*From the Establishment of the Frank Kingdom to the Present Time.*" The rest of the volume, comprising in all 659 pages, is occupied with an Appendix of original documents, of which we shall have occasion to speak presently; and with a Supplement relating to a Plan of the City which accompanies the work.

In the second volume, the topography and site of the Holy Sepulchre is discussed, and the genuineness of the traditional site defended; its architectural history is elaborated by Professor Willis, in his peculiarly masterly style; and the antiquities without the walls are examined. The whole is wound up by a chapter on Modern Jerusalem and its Inhabitants.

Such are the contents of the work before us; and we shall probably best consult the taste of our readers, if we present them with a few extracts. It strikes us, that the historical sketch in

vol. i. is one of the "additions" which distinguish, and, we may say, improve the second edition. Perhaps it is owing to the peculiar biographical kind of style in which the Old Testament is composed, but readers of the Bible do not seem to have acquired generally that comprehension of the connected history of the Jewish people which they obtain of other nations, and without which the full force of many passages is lost. We would recommend to them this portion of Mr. Williams' book. It is necessarily sketchy, yet sufficiently full to make it interesting; while this very interest leaves on the mind a desire for a more minute account. At the same time, we think the compiler might have infused into his narrative a little more liveliness here and there with advantage. It is a little dry. It smacks of the archæologian.

At p. 8, in speaking of the Ark, it is stated, that it was deposited in the Tabernacle, when that was pitched at Shiloh; and that "there it remained until the time of Eli the priest, except that it was occasionally carried to the national assemblies of the children of Israel, to add solemnity to their meetings." In support of this assertion, we are referred to Josh. xxiv. 1. 25, 26[1], which passages appear to us by no means to prove the assertion in the text. There is no reference in them to the Ark, unless indeed (which is scarcely probable), Mr. W. sees the presence of the Ark implied in Joshua's making a covenant with the people. Covenants were confirmed by sacrifice; but we never heard that it was deemed necessary for the Ark to be present. It is an interesting fact, that which Mr. W. mentions, if it be true; but we should like to know his grounds for the assertion.

Several very interesting geographical and chronological questions are mooted in the course of the work, and divers conjectures are hazarded; some of them with an air of great probability: others we do not feel so well satisfied with; as, for instance, where he tells us that the message contained in the twenty-seventh chapter of Jeremiah was spoken *propheticallv* during the reign of Jehoiakim. This notion is supported solely by the first verse of the chapter. To us it appears much more probable that the word "Jehoiakim" there is a mistake of the scribe for "Zedekiah;" see the twelfth verse of the same chapter, and the first of the succeeding one. Since writing the above, we have referred to Blayney, who directly corroborates our view, both as his own opinion and Lowth's; and informs us that "Zedekiah"

[1] In note (3) there is a typographical error of viii. 43, for viii. 33.

is found in one MS. of good repute and antiquity—in the margin of another, and probably in a third; as well as in the Syriac, and in the Oxford MS. of the Arabic version. And it is a somewhat significant fact that the LXX omit this first verse altogether: thus making verse 12 to come in quite naturally, instead of creating a difficulty, as in our English version.

Among his geographical conjectures may be mentioned that of the celebrated Tarshish being Tartessus in Spain; his identification of Kirjath-jearim, and of the mountain-barrier to the south of the Promised Land. But by far the most interesting are the *discoveries* (we employ the writer's own word, without meaning to stand sponsor for the exactness of it) of Beer-lahai-roi and Kadesh. These are contained in a long letter, printed in the Appendix, from the Rev. J. Rowlands of Queen's College. It abounds with the true enthusiasm of a traveller, and we cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of making some extracts from it. Mr. R. had been travelling from Gaza to Khalasa. Two hours and a half [2] from this latter city, in a direct line to Suez, he came upon traces of an ancient site, called Sabâta, answering (he is of opinion) to ancient Zephath or Hormah, the Arabic form of which would be Sebât. (Judges i. 17.) A quarter of an hour brought him to Rohébeh (he imagines the *Rehobeth* of Gen. xxvi. 22); and ten hours more to "a place called Moilahi, a grand resting-place of the caravans, there being water here, as the name implies:"—

"It lies (he continues) in one of two or three passages or openings in the very southernmost hills or southern border of the Land of Promise, which form the grand outlet from Palestine into the desert, or the grand entrance from the desert into Palestine, by which the great caravan roads from Akaba, Mount Sinai, and Suez, pass to Hebron and to Gaza. Shall I not please you, when I tell you that we found here Bir Lahai-roi? We slept one night close to the water; and my happiness would have been double what it was, if you had been with us. I can tell you that I have found it to my entire satisfaction; I have no doubt about it whatever.

"Now for my proofs. (1) Moilâhhi lies on the great road from Beersheba to Shur, or Jebel es-*Sur*, which is its present name, a grand chain of mountains running north and south, a little east of the longitude of Suez, lying, as Shur did, *before* Egypt. (Gen. xvi. 7.) (2) It is probable, from Gen. xvi. 14, that Bir Lahai-roi was not far from Kadesh: Moilâhhi is about twelve miles from Kadesh. But (3)

[2] *i. e.* about $6\frac{2}{3}$ miles; for he somewhere tells us that camels travel at the rate of 12 miles in $4\frac{1}{2}$ hours.

the grand settling-point is its present name. The well has disappeared, and the 'Bir' (well) very naturally has been changed into 'Moi' (water); and, what is very remarkable, the Arabs of the country call it Moilâhhi Hadjar (Hagar) . . . . and this, as they explained to me, not from the rocky mountains near, but from the name of a person called Hagar: and, to confirm this statement of theirs, they conducted us to the *house* of Hagar (Beit Hajar), where they said such a person lived. It is about half or three-quarters of a mile from Moilâhhi, in a ravine among the hills. It is certainly a curious place; its description is simply this:—a square chamber, of no great dimensions, excavated in the perpendicular face of a rock, at some height above the base; the entrance into this is by a passage bored through the rock from beneath, with a winding staircase of good steps cut in the rock, leading up into the middle of the floor of the chamber. Behind this chamber are three other small chambers connected with it, which may possibly have served as dormitories, not at all like tombs, nor showing any evidence whatever of their having been a sepulchre; its name is Beit Hajar, or the house of Hagar. Whether Ishmael may have constructed this as a refuge for his mother after her final expulsion from Abraham's house, or whether Ishmael himself passed any of his time here, it is very difficult of course now to say, though the Bedouins maintain the former. This is certainly true, that (4) 'the wilderness of Paran,' where Ishmael is said to have dwelt (Gen. xxi. 21), lies immediately to the south of this; a grand plain, bounded on the west by Halal and Yelek, on the east by the mountains or wilderness of Kadesh and Jebel el-Khirm, on the north by the southern hills of Judea, or rather of the *promised* (not of the *possessed*) land. This is *El-Paran*, or plain of Paran, alluded to Gen. xiv. 6. . . . Shur, or Sur, lies at its south-west extremity, and Kadesh at its north-east extremity. This plain is the Paran through which the Hebrews came from Sinai on their way to Kadesh. (Numb. xii. 16; xiii. 26.)"

Having remarked that probably the wilderness of Kadesh was also called the wilderness of Paran, from the adjacent plain, as it was called that of Kadesh, from the *fountain* of Kadesh, he continues,—

"Our excitement (I can speak at least for mine) while we stood before the rock smitten by Moses, and gazed upon the *lovely stream* which still issues forth from under the base of this rock, was such as baffles description. I cannot say that we stood *still*—our excitement was so great that we could not stand still—we paced backwards and forwards, examining the rock and the source of the stream, looking at the pretty little cascades which it forms as it descends into the channel of a rain-torrent beneath, some times chipping off some pieces of the rock, and at other times picking up some specimens, or some flowers along a green slope beneath it. The rock is a large single mass on a small hill of solid rock, a spire of the mountain

to the north of it rising immediately above it: it is the only *visible* naked rock in the whole district. The stream when it reaches the channel turns westward, and, after running about three or four hundred yards, loses itself in the sand. I have not seen such a lovely sight any where else in the whole desert—such a copious and lovely stream. . . . The waters of Kădēs, called Ain Kades, lies to the east of the highest part of Jebel Halal, towards its northern extremity, about twelve miles (or four hours and a half by camel) to the E.S.E. of Moilâhhi. I think it must be something like due south from Khalasa. But to the *proofs*. 1. Its name Kădēs, or Kŭdēs (pronounced in English Kaddáse or Kuddáse), is exactly the Arabic form of the Hebrew name Kadesh. . . . . 2. The locality corresponds with or falls in the line of the southern boundary of the Promised Land (Josh. xv. 1. 8), from the southern extremity of the Dead Sea, by Safaa or Maaleh Akrabbim, the Wady el *Murra*, and the Wady el Arish, or the river of Egypt. 3. It corresponds also with the order in which the places of the borders are mentioned. . . . . 4. It lies east of Jebel el-Halal, or Mount *Halak*, mentioned some where by Jeremiah as the uttermost extremity of the Promised Land to the south. 5. It lies at the foot of the mountain of the Amorite (Deut. i. 19). 6. It is situated near the grand pass or entrance into the Promised Land by Beer Lahai-roi, which is the only *easy* entrance from the desert to the east of Halal, and most probably the entrance to which the Hebrews were conducted from Sinai towards the Land of Promise. A good road leads to this place all the way from Sinai. . . . 9. The nature of the locality itself answers in every respect to the description given of it in Scripture, or rather inferred from it—the mountains to the east of Kades, and some very grand ones to the south, called Jebel Kădēs, "the wilderness of Kadesh;" the rock, the water, and the grand space for encampment which lies to the south-west of it, a large rectangular plain, about nine by five, or ten by six miles, and this opening to the west into the still more extensive plain of Paran." —vol. i. pp. 464—468.

There is a long note at p. 24, on the *vexata quæstio* as to the meaning of "Millo," which occurs in 2 Sam. v. 9, and other passages. Mr. W. thinks that most of the apparently contradictory opinions may be reconciled; and takes it to have been "a public building . . . crossed by the mound erected by Solomon," viz. the causeway by which he effected a junction between the hill on which stood his palace and Mount Moriah (see 1 Kings x. 5). We had intended to have made a few remarks upon this; but the length of the previous extract obliges us to pass on, with simply observing that we do not see how, on this supposition, to account for the almost constant term by which the LXX render the Hebrew Millo—*τὴν ἄκραν*. If we might venture upon a conjecture we would ask, whether it be not simpler to suppose

it to have been that famous causeway itself, whence the name extended to the whole valley? This *filling up* of the valley of the Tyropœon will sufficiently account for the Hebrew root מָלֵא *to fill;* and a work of such unrivalled magnitude would well merit the notoriety implied in the article which is invariably prefixed, whether ἄκρα or ἀνάλημμα be the word employed by the LXX.

It is commonly said that misfortune makes friends. This would appear to be inapplicable to the Samaritans. The same disposition which manifested itself in the comparatively palmy days when our Lord sojourned upon earth (see Luke ix. 53, and John iv. 9,) still holds its ground.

"The Samaritans, found only at Nablouse [the ancient Neapolis, close to Jacob's well], are distinguishable from all other denominations, by their somewhat Jewish physiognomy, the red turban peculiar to them, and *their deep-seated hatred of the Jews.* They receive only the Pentateuch, are rigid observers of the law, and sacrifice three times a year on Mount Gerizim."—vol. i. p. 39, note.

Mr. Williams' history is necessarily (as we have remarked) sketchy in its character—even so sketchy, as to make one desiderate here and there a little more circumstantiality: his style, while it never sinks into the slipshod, seldom rises to eloquence. It flows on in a calm, steady course; it is the writing of one who is more concerned to deliver truthfully the facts before him, than desirous to win an interest in them. He is rather the compiler of annals, than the composer of history. At the same time we should be doing injustice to the estimable writer if we omitted to state, that the pen of the annalist halts here and there, while that of the Christian and the Churchman steps in, to seize the opportunity for a brief moral reflection, or a happy application to our own times of some principle violated or involved. Occasionally, however, the author warms with his subject, and draws a picture at once animated and interesting. We will give an extract of the latter description, taken from his account of Herod the Great.

"But the last days of Herod were to witness a repetition of the terrific acts of its commencement; and family feuds were again to embroil his home in trouble, and to embrue his hands with blood. The two sons of the murdered Mariamne, who had been educated at Rome, were brought back by their father when age and polite education had perfected them in such graces and accomplishments as they had inherited from their mother. They became the idols of the people. Their popu-

larity excited the envy of Pheroras and Salome, a brother and sister of Herod, who had, indeed, too just cause to dread their displeasure for the part which they had acted towards the unhappy Mariamne, which her children were too generous not to feel, too frank and noble-minded not to conceal; and as the king was now advanced in years, and the accession of the young men to power was probably not far distant, no time was to be lost in getting them out of the way. The alliance of Aristobulus, the elder of the two brothers, to the daughter of Salome, tended in no measure to reconcile her to the child of the woman whom she had so deeply injured, and falsehood and calumny were incessantly plied, until the father's affections were completely estranged from his darling boys. Antipater, a son of Herod by his first wife, was introduced at court, and entered into the evil councils of his designing aunt with all the eagerness of one bent on his own advancement. The counter influence thus strengthened was too powerful for the two brothers. Being accused before the tribunal of Augustus, as plotting against their father's life, they pleaded their defence with all the simplicity of conscious innocence, were honourably acquitted, and a temporary reconciliation with their father was the result. But on their return to Judea the attempts of Salome were renewed, and seconded by letters of Antipater, who was now at Rome, and by the treacherous villany of a foreign spy; until the king, worked up to a pitch of frenzy, was at last not only prepared to believe, but forward to invite accusations, so that the very servants were tortured or bribed to calumniate them. The young men wearied out with this incessant persecution, resolved to retire from the country, and to seek refuge first with Archelaus, king of Cappadocia, father-in-law of Alexander, and finally at Rome. Their intentions were discovered, and represented as an overt act of treason; and Augustus was prevailed upon to allow the victims to be put on trial for their lives, before a Roman court at Berytus. The wretched father here appeared in person as the accuser of his sons; and so ably did he advocate the cause of injustice and inhumanity, with such vehemence and violence did he press the suit against them, that the judges were absolutely prevailed upon to return a sentence of condemnation, and the two brothers were strangled at Sebaste.

"Justly might the odium of this deed of blood attach to the villanous Antipater, and most righteous was the vengeance which speedily overtook him. Having removed these rival claimants from his father's crown, nothing now remained but to bring to the grave, no matter how, the hoary head which it now encircled. Herod had cherished a nest of vipers in his own house, and was doomed himself to be the next victim. Salome his sister, Pheroras his brother, and Antipater his cherished son, conspired together to poison him. The success of this plot was hindered by the death of Pheroras; and an investigation which ensued on the suspicion of his having met a violent death, led to the discovery of the whole of the dark design, in which Antipater had taken part with

the most diabolical determination. He was immediately summoned from Rome, where he was awaiting the explosion of the mine to which he had laid the train, in a letter full of affection, and arrived at Jerusalem without suspecting the cause of his recall. His salutation was repulsed with horror by his indignant father, who now threw off the mask, and on the following day he was put upon his trial before Quintilius Varus, the president of Syria, whom Herod had already called to Jerusalem to act as his assessor on this occasion. The eloquent Nicolaus of Damascus was counsel for the prosecution; witnesses flocked forward in crowds, judging it a righteous act to expose such monstrous wickedness. The most frightful aggravations of the most cold-blooded schemes of villany came out on the trial, until Herod himself, recreant as he was, stood aghast at enormities exceeding his own; while the perjured wretch, in the face of the deepest evidence, with well-dissembled horror at the imputations, called God to witness his innocence! He was condemned to death; but some delay was necessary, until the sentence should be confirmed at Rome.

"In this interval king Herod, who had now attained his seventieth year, was attacked with that dreadful malady which terminated his life. But his sun was to set in blood, even as it had risen. Among other adornments of the temple of Jerusalem, he had erected a large golden eagle over the principal gate. Two of the most celebrated rabbies, Judas and Matthias, expecting the speedy issue of his incurable disease, encouraged some of their young pupils to demolish this emblem of idolatry: a report was soon after raised that the king was dead, and the eagle was instantly destroyed. The report was unfounded. Forty of the young men were apprehended by the temple-guard, and the instigators of the sedition voluntarily surrendered, glorying in the act. The king, maddened by the fury of the disease, tortured with the conviction that his approaching dissolution was anxiously expected by his subjects, furious at the insult offered to him at almost his last hour, ordered the whole number to be burnt alive! Meanwhile his body was consuming with an internal fire, and his heart inflamed with the wildest passions. Can it be believed that he had ordered his sister Salome to gather together, and confine in the hippodrome, the principal Jews in all the country, to be slaughtered immediately on his death, that there might be a national mourning at his funeral? Humanity may rejoice that the dreadful order was never executed. The last act of his sanguinary reign, when he had failed in an attempt on his own life, was to confirm the order for the execution of his son Antipater. Five days after this he died in extreme agony at Jericho, in the thirty-seventh year of his reign, and was magnificently buried at Herodium; while the frantic cries of the desolate mothers of Bethlehem, mourning for their infants, whose execution he had lately ordered, formed his funeral dirge, and attended his guilty soul into the presence of his righteous Judge!" —vol. i. pp. 119—123.

We really are inclined to think that Mr. Williams would do

well to publish a revised reprint of the six chapters of Part I. as a volume for one of the several juvenile libraries which the last few years have placed at the service of the rising generation. Embellished with the wood-cuts scattered up and down the present work, it would form a volume, written on sound principles, and not more attractive than needed. Take, for example, the following contrast, drawn from the description of the sacking of the Holy City by the victorious armies in the first crusade.

"Alas! the soldiers of the cross were little mindful of his precepts and example in his dying prayer for his murderers. Humanity shudders and religion revolts at the frightful carnage committed under his banner by these inhuman butchers, flushed with victory, thirsting for blood, and wholly devoted to its terrible work. The two generals, advancing from opposite quarters, met in the middle of the city, leaving the ensanguined streets behind them so thickly strewn with the mangled corses of their victims as to be almost impassable, the miserable fugitives being intercepted between the two detachments. Such as escaped immediate death fled to the court of the Temple, and a few to the castle of David. The former became the next object of attack. . . . Ten thousand of the enemy are said to have fallen in this confined space; the number slain in the city was not to be estimated. It had been before agreed that the victors should have for their share of the booty what each could seize for himself; and the consequence was that houses were dispossessed of their occupants by the indiscriminate slaughter of whole families, some being slain with the sword, others thrown headlong into the streets.

"The transition in the events of this day fills, perhaps, the most striking page in the history of enthusiasm. When the arms of the conquerors were wearied, and their swords blunt with slaughter; when guards had been stationed in the towers and at the gates as a precaution against a sudden attack; the whole multitude, having laid aside their weapons, washed their hands and changed their garments; with bare feet, and groans and tears, the outward indications of a humble spirit and truly contrite heart, mingled with hymns and spiritual songs of praise, proceeded to the venerable places which their Saviour had deigned to adorn and sanctify by his presence, but especially to the scenes of his passion and resurrection; kissing and embracing each sacred memorial with indescribable fervour and devotion. Their tears were tears of joy and gratitude; their sighs and sobs appeared to proceed from hearts wholly inflamed with love, and to ascend as a whole and acceptable burnt-offering to God. To this succeeded works of mercy and bountiful almsgiving. The newly-acquired spoil was bestowed with prodigal profusion on those who had acquired nothing for themselves; and they who, an hour before, with greedy avarice, had seized all on which they could lay their hands, now voluntarily impoverished themselves, and counted the privilege of this day their all-sufficient reward!"—vol. i. pp. 374—376.

A glance at the Table of Contents prefixed to the first volume would give one the notion that the author had been unhappy in the choice of his title. "The Holy Land," rather than "the Holy City," it would seem, had been a more appropriate designation of the work. But none will feel disposed to quarrel with the title, when they consider how completely—from the times of David to the present day—Jerusalem has been the one centre of interest and importance. Thither flocked the devout sons of Israel annually—"the tribes of the Lord went up," even as their thoughts and hopes were bent towards *it* for the glories of "the deliverer" who was yet to come. And round that sacred shrine Christian efforts have now for eighteen hundred years been gathered, one while to dislodge the infidel profanation, one while to honour with the kiss of grateful reverence, scenes of small intrinsic value, but where

> "even the lifeless stone is dear
> For thoughts of HIM."

Yes; and on Jerusalem must the eye of interest be fixed even till the end, so long as God's chosen people continue to wander up and down the earth, scattered from their land of promise, and the prophecies of restoration remain to be fulfilled; so long as aught "withholdeth" the last great struggle of Antichrist, and the nations be to be gathered to the plains of Armageddon, and the world be to witness the revelation of the Son of Man.

Upon these events of the world's last age, as connected with the Holy City, Mr. Williams has some sensible remarks. Having observed that we have scripture warrant for concluding that "it is yet to be the theatre of great and important actions," he asks, "what is to be the condition of Palestine during this interval?" In reply he first of all quotes for his readers' amusement the solution proposed by a popular writer of one of the two vainest nations of the world. M. Poujoulat decides that

> "In order that the fall of the Ottoman empire may subserve the cause of civilization in the East, she (viz. the English vulture) must be checked. The only means to effect this is the union of France and Russia. The active and persevering spirit of the latter requires the genius of France to enable her to fulfil her destinies: and France, on her side, demands this grand support to enable her to triumph over an enemy whose glory is of necessity the abasement of her own. Austria will of course assist. This accomplished, France, the champion of the faith, guided by her conquering genius, is to plant the cross in all the Asiatic capitals, as thirty years ago she planted her standard on all the

capitals of Europe[1]; and the regeneration of the East is to be accomplished by her missionaries."

To the following reply to this we would beg the attention of a certain set of people in our own country, who seem to have some hideous image of the Czar for ever brooding like a nightmare over them. Russian ambition, Russian intolerance, Russian designs upon Constantinople, the disturbance of the balance of power, these are the bugbears of their political peace of mind. Mr. W. continues:—

"Now without advancing any claim to political discernment, still less to prophetic prescience, I venture to pronounce that there is no combination further without the reach of probability than this, no expectations less likely to be realized. Russia must forget the French invasion and sacking of Moscow, both must forget the memorable retreat for which Russia offers her annual *Te Deum*, before such a coalition as that here contemplated can be effected; and the holy orthodox Church of the East, the Church of the Russian Empire, must acknowledge the Pope's claims to supremacy, which she has resisted since they were first advanced, before she will delegate to French priests the duty which she is commissioned to perform. The protection of the oppressed Christians in the East has devolved on the autocrat of Russia; it is his high prerogative, it is his solemn duty as a Christian, and as a faithful son of the Holy Church Catholic. That duty he will perform. The establishment of the orthodox Church in his dominions commends it to his special regard; the extension of its limits so as to comprehend the seat of the chief patriarch of the Armenians, has entitled that important community to his countenance and support; and the fact of the frontiers of the two most formidable Mohammedan powers bordering on his gigantic empire, gives a weight to his arbitration which no other Christian sovereign can exercise. And I confess that when I observed the silent and beneficial influence of Russia, as exercised by her representatives in the East, with a degree of impartiality which I did not expect, but especially when I contrasted it with the busy, restless interference of the French political agents, aiming only at the aggrandizement of Rome, with a love too fierce even for its favoured objects, I could not participate in the jealous and suspicious fears with which my countrymen are wont to regard Russian diplomacy. And further, when I discovered that the laws of Russia have contrived to reconcile the firmest possible support to the national Church, with

[1] Histoire de Jerusalem, t. iii. p. 275. This flourish will be thought exaggerated by me; I can assure the reader that I translate the nonsense verbatim, and have omitted as much equally silly. [It is entertaining to place alongside of this the late letter of the President of the Republic himself to Colonel Ney at Rome, in which he writes, that "at the time when our armies made the tour of Europe, they left every where, as the traces of their passage, the germs of liberty, and the destruction of the abuses of the feudal system."]

the greatest degree of toleration to other communities, better than any country[2], I could not but feel that the extension of those laws might prove most salutary to the East in its present distracted state. On the other hand, the suppression of many ancient sees in Georgia, on its annexation to the empire at the commencement of the last reign, with the subjection of that whole Church to the Holy Governing Synod of Russia (whose constitution is not unexceptionable in itself, and which certainly could exercise no rightful jurisdiction over independent bishops without the free consent of their Church), had led me to apprehend an uncanonical interference with the ancient Patriarchates, in the event here contemplated. But these apprehensions have been much allayed by the liberal and enlightened policy displayed on occasion of the late vacancy in the highest dignity of the Armenian Church, when a free election by the whole body was not only allowed, but invited and ensured, by the high authority of an imperial ukase[3]. And if the report of some late enactments had awakened alarm in behalf of the Jews (whose interests demand the second consideration in all views of Eastern politics), a more accurate knowledge of the facts of the case, and the promulgation of an edict affecting them, dictated by a spirit of consideration worthy of a Christian monarch[4], has convinced me that the lives and liberties of the Israelites would be no less safe in the custody of Russia than of any other Christian power."—vol. i. pp. 457—459.

We come now to the second, or topographical and archæological portion of "the Holy City."

That not merely the appearance, but the plan and limits, of modern Jerusalem are very different from those of the city as it stood eighteen centuries ago, is a fact which is doubtless taken for granted by every one of our readers. Nor will the least enthusiastic among them, probably, have conceived a doubt that many or even most of the sites, on which deeds of such surpassing interest were severally once enacted, have been preserved with scrupulous fidelity, and can be pointed to with something like precision. Mount Calvary, for instance, the scene of our Blessed Saviour's passion,—this at least is known. For ourselves, we confess that, in our simplicity, we too had thought so, till within the last few years. Jerusalem (so we argued) was for several centuries the centre of a see of great importance; its bishops honoured with peculiar precedency[5]; and its sacred precincts venerated, even by

[2] In proof of the former, I appeal to the Oustaff, or Code of Laws for the regulation of the Holy Governing Synod, &c. &c.; and to the testimony of foreign residents in Russia, for the latter.

[3] The free election of the Patriarch Narcissus to the highest dignity of the Armenian Church took place at Etchmiazine, April 17, 1843, and was confirmed at St. Petersburg, August 10, in the same year.

[4] I allude to an ukase, dated Gatchina, November $\frac{13}{25}$, 1844, addressed to the minister of public instruction, relating to the education of the Jews.

[5] See Canon vii. of the Council of Nice, A.D. 325.

emperors, beyond every spot on earth. There the holy Cyril instructed the faithful; and there a succession of bishops have sat on apostolic thrones, tracing their spiritual descent to this day from St. James himself. In such a city then, surely, of all cities in Christendom, tradition must have kept guard with undeviating watchfulness. Moreover, it is notorious that Constantine sought out the place of the Crucifixion, and that of the burying of our Lord, and erected thereupon a magnificent church, which, after three several destructions, has re-appeared by the pious care of Christian hands. What doubt, then, that the Church of the Resurrection or Holy Sepulchre, now standing at Jerusalem, indicates with fidelity the very spot to which its name bears testimony.

Aye; what doubt indeed? Gentle reader, it was reserved for the enlightened scepticism of our countryman, Dr. Clarke, a few years ago, and very lately for the presbyterian antipathies of a transatlantic traveller, to discredit traditions traceable to the most remote antiquity, and to attempt to shake the innocent belief in which thousands have reposed. A certain Mr. Fergusson has likewise followed in their wake. To the *pious* labours of these gentlemen we are indebted for the volumes now before us. Mr. Williams, possessed of too truthful a spirit to desire to uphold what was false merely because it was venerable, was determined to investigate the matter for himself. The first edition of his book was (we believe) attacked by Dr. Robinson with more invective than argument[6]; and this second one, consequently, assumes a controversial attitude, which seems, under the circumstances, to have been unavoidable. Its *plan* is to dissect the arguments, one by one, which Dr. Robinson has advanced; and then, having disposed of them, to bring forward his own view[7].

Dr. R.'s plan, by the way, does seem most strange and unreasonable. Such was his prejudice against ecclesiastical tradition, that he determined as a principle "to avoid as far as possible all contact with the convents and the authority of the monks" during his investigations! To whom, then, did he look for information? He "applied solely for information to the native Arab population." In other words, he would accept a tradition—if he could find one—from the mouth of a Mohammedan; but his Protestantism was too pure to allow his ears to be sullied by tra-

[6] He acknowledges with much candour that he had himself provoked it; see the "Preface to the Second Edition," p. vi.

[7] We say "Dr. Robinson," for he has now become the chief, as he is doubtless the most able, champion of the anti-traditional party. Mr. Fergusson's guns are of very small calibre; and Dr. Clarke—there is abundant evidence to prove—has been greatly over-rated.

ditions from beneath a Christian cowl! The value of native information is amusingly illustrated by Mr. Williams in the following note, at p. 5 of his second volume. The native Arabs, he says—

"are very apt to adopt, not merely the traditions of Monks, but the suggestions of travellers, and to pass them off as authoritative. In 1843, I was pointed out, on the sea of Tiberias, the site of Bethsaida, where a friend and myself had endeavoured to fix it in the preceding year, by the very boatman who on my former visit had denied all knowledge of such a name! He was a *native* Mohammedan."

But to return: The chief question to be settled is—whether or no the Church of the Holy Sepulchre stands upon the site of that "new sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid." Now it must be remembered that in any place answering to this, there are certain conditions to be satisfied; for we are distinctly told that "in the place where He was crucified, there was a garden," and that "the place where Jesus was crucified was nigh to the city[8]," *i.e. outside* the city, consequently the question hinges on the site of the ancient walls. Although the present city stretches considerably farther to the west than the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, are there yet any traces of the ancient walls which may serve to demonstrate—if not the certainty that our Lord's tomb lay where tradition has evermore affirmed, yet—the *possibility* that tradition has spoken truly, inasmuch as the locality indicated *would* have been *without* the limits of the then existing city? This, as we have said, is the main question which Mr. Williams's second volume answers; but the course of investigation which this led him into, has enabled him to determine several other sites. At least, so he says:—with what truth it will be for the public to judge. The strict examination of arguments, the severe sifting and testing of evidence which the matter demands, we have not yet been able to carry sufficiently far to justify us in pronouncing a verdict. This, therefore, forms no part of our object in the present article: we must defer it to a future opportunity. All that we desire at present is, to give to our readers some notion of the state of the controversy, and to call attention to a subject as remarkable as it is important. And if we appear to write rather in the light of advocates, than of judges, this must be taken as the reason; for we are doing hardly more than analysing the statement of one of the parties in court.

If the reader will take any tolerably good plan of ancient Jerusalem[9], he will—it may be hoped—be able to follow us in the succeeding remarks.

[8] John xix. 20. 41.

[9] The plans attached to the maps of Palestine, ancient and modern, by Professor Hughes, and published by Knight under the supervision of the Society for

The city originally occupied two hills, separated by a valley. The southernmost and higher of these was called Mount Zion, or—by Josephus—the upper forum; in distinction from the lower city, or Acra—which was (says Josephus) in shape gibbous. He also designates the intervening valley by the name of Tyropœon. The Temple-mount (Moriah) had been a third hill over against Acra, originally separated from it likewise by a valley, which the Asmonean princes filled up. In process of time, however (writes Josephus), as population increased, a fourth eminence—to the north of the temple and close to the hill of Acra—was surrounded with dwellings: this was called Bezetha, or the New City. Each of these three portions of the city was surrounded by a distinct wall; of which the first and second, surrounding the upper and lower cities, were ancient; the third, round the new city, was built by Agrippa in the reign of the Emperor Claudius. The walls are described as follows:—

The Hippic tower, at the north-west angle of Zion, being assumed as a starting point, the first wall extended along the northern brow of Zion in an easterly direction, and was joined to the western cloister of the Temple, which was completely surrounded by a wall of its own. In the opposite direction it ran with a western and southern aspect round Zion, above the fountain of Siloam (which may be described as beyond the south-eastern angle of the city), then turned, and was joined at length to the eastern cloister of the Temple. "This wall must have twice crossed the Tyropœon, in order to reach the Temple, and from the fountain of Siloam there was a wall along the eastern brow of Zion, to meet the wall which bounded it on the north." "Of the second wall we are only told, it commenced at a place[1] called the Gate of Gennath [garden], a point in the first wall of Hippicus, and encircling the northern part of the city, was joined to the fortress Antonia, which occupied a considerable space at the north-west of the Temple area." The wall of Agrippa, like the first wall, commenced at the Hippic tower, extended far towards the north, passed to the upper part of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, and following the course of the valley was joined at length to the Temple wall at its north-eastern angle. For a fuller description the reader may consult Mr. Williams' work, vol. i. pp. 146—148, and the Supplement, § VII., for the ancient topography: vol. ii. pp. 8—12, for the modern disposition. We need hardly say, that a disquisition relating to the topography of Jerusalem as it

Promoting Useful Knowledge, will be found as good and distinct as—and, we need not say, far cheaper than—any other. We may remark that Mr. Hughes seems to have constructed his plan upon the descriptions of Dr. Robinson; an act which, we suspect, will be found to have led him into some gross inconsistencies.

[1] See below, p. 188.

existed in our Saviour's time, cannot be concerned with the third wall.

The interior of the city at this day is divided into five quarters, respectively called the Christian quarter, the Mohammedan, the Armenian, the Jewish, and the Haram. Of these, the two former compose, broadly speaking, the northern half of the city, the Christian lying to the west of the other; the Armenian and Jewish quarters occupy the western and eastern halves respectively of that part of Mount Zion which is included in the modern city; while *El-Haram es-Sherif*, or the noble Sanctuary, stands where once stood the temple on Mount Moriah, and contains the mosks, &c. of the Moslem worship.

In order to investigate the disputed question, as to whether that portion of the Christian quarter now occupied by the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, was or was not included in the second wall of the city, as described by Josephus, it was necessary to determine certain other prominent points in the description given above. These are, then, 1. the site of the Hippic tower; 2. the position of the gate Gennath, and the line of the Second Wall; 3. the situation of Acra; and 4. the course of the Tyropœon.

With regard to the first, Mr. Williams, following Dr. Robinson, in his first edition assumed that the site of the Hippic tower corresponded with that of the tower of David at the north-east of the present citadel [2]. But he here shows ground for concluding, that it occupied a space at the north-west, instead of the north-eastern angle of the platform of the modern citadel: not (as he confesses) that this will materially affect the questions at issue between them.

The gate Gennath he places about 1000 feet nearly due east of the Hippic tower; that is, sufficiently far to admit a magnificent palace, which, according to Josephus' account, Herod had there, comprising many porticoes, groves, &c., besides "two immense chambers, so large and splendid that the Temple itself could not be compared with them." Taking for his groundwork a passage in Josephus' account of the siege by Titus, Dr. Robinson had made the gate Gennath to be identical with a gate "by which water was brought into the tower Hippicus." Mr. Williams shows reason for believing that this *water*-gate was on the *south* of Hippicus, in the *west* wall of Zion; and assigns the *garden*-gate to "another anonymous gate, hard by the Hippic tower [3]," and sufficiently far to the east of the Pool of the Bath to allow of

[2] D'Anville placed it nearly 3000 feet to the N.W. of this, making it to correspond with the Psephine tower.

[3] We are not sure that we have correctly given the author's meaning in this passage.

a proper interval between it and the bank, which Josephus says was raised by the fifteenth legion about thirty cubits eastward of the pool. See from p. 17 to 24. Near to this gate the second wall had its commencement.

We cannot expect Mr. Williams to write with greater accuracy than the historian whom he translates; but we do expect that he will write consistently with himself. We say this in no unfriendly spirit; and we feel sure that he will be the first to acknowledge the very great increase of difficulty which is forced upon readers of a work like his by even slight inaccuracies. At p. 24 of vol. ii. he is correcting an inaccuracy of Dr. Robinson's, and quotes Josephus as saying, that "the sacred wall had its beginning *near* the gate Gennath." But at p. 148 of vol. i. he writes, that "it commenced *at* a place called the gate of Gennath." The two statements appear to us to represent an important difference in the state of things. The historian's own expression is indefinite: he says of this wall, that it *τὴν μὲν ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ πύλης εἶχεν, ἣν Γεννὰθ ἐκάλουν.*

Mr. Williams then proceeds to compare the Acra of Josephus with that of the American traveller, which covers a large space directly north of Mount Zion, and including (so far as we can gather—but the learned Doctor has never yet aided his description with a plan of the ancient walls) the whole extent of the modern city in the north-west or Christian quarter. The result is, that Dr. Robinson's Acra presents a complete contrast to that of the ancient historian, both in altitude and character; the former being the termination of a broad ridge of land lying to the north-west, *instead of* a distinct hill—leaving therefore a long, high, and somewhat level swell of land without the supposed walls in this direction; *instead of* being one of two hills "every where enclosed from without by deep valleys[4], considerably higher than Zion, *instead of* occupying "the lower hill;" and, lastly, separated from Zion by no valley at all which can at present be distinctly traced, *instead of* there lying between them that remarkable gorge called the Tyropœon. Dr. Robinson does indeed profess to point to the course which the Tyropœon took, which has, however, "become gradually and wholly filled up with the ruins and rubbish of eighteen centuries[5]."

Now it must be remembered that another valley, which once

[4] It is right to mention that Dr. R. declares he has doubts as to the literal correctness of this expression. But if another position can be pointed out, and Mr. W. seems to have done so, fulfilling the other data of Josephus, *and this as well*, why should a doubt be thrown in *this* particular upon the words of a writer who is remarkable for his accuracy?

[5] Theolog. Review, p. 419.—Dr. R.'s organ.

separated Acra from Moriah, was filled up with earth by the Asmoneans, with the view of joining the city to the temple. Yet *this* valley—or what Dr. Robinson supposes to be this valley—remains most distinctly to this day, as he himself constantly testifies. "Now," argues Mr. Williams, "I cannot think that a valley filled with earth by the Asmoneans, and greatly filled up with the rubbish of so many centuries, would still exist as one of the principal features of the city; especially while another valley, more distinctly marked in olden time, and never designedly filled, has been obliterated for at least six centuries; which . . . . . Dr. Robinson conceives has been the case with the Tyropœon. At least the traces of the valley between Sion and Acra might be expected to be more distinctly marked, than of the valley between Acra and Moriah; which is far from being the case if the topography of Dr. Robinson is correct." (Vol. ii. p. 28.) Besides all this, two arguments are adduced on the same side,—one drawn from the actual position of the lowest line of depression in that quarter of the city; the other from the late discovery of a very ancient sewer, whose course is, in part, precisely that of the Doctor's Tyropœon. Moreover, it is remarkable that all ancient writers—Josephus, Tacitus, and William of Tyre,—all describe the city as occupying two eminences. Can any one doubt (as Mr. Williams some where asks) that they intend the two ridges divided by the valley which I have called the Tyropœon? and would it not, then, be preposterous to place the Upper and Lower City on one ridge, and on the same side of that valley?

"On these grounds then (writes Mr. W.), that the gate of Gennath must have been some distance east of Hippicus; that the Acra of Josephus is a complete contrast in altitude and character with the ridge north of Zion; that no distinct valley now exists, nor can be proved ever to have existed, between this ridge and Zion, I am obliged to reject the topographical identifications of Dr. Robinson, and to propose a theory more consistent with the representations of the Jewish historian [6]."—vol. ii. p. 35.

Before we go further, we must be allowed to make an observation. It is that Mr. Williams has here again, as it appears to us, added very unnecessarily to the difficulty of following him in his complex argument, in favour of his own and in demolition of Dr. Robinson's theory. In the passage copied above, he speaks

[6] The reader will find the valley of the Tyropœon, according to the course which Dr. R. would have us to believe it took, distinctly marked in Prof. Hughes's map, before referred to. Also the gate of Gennath, placed close to the Hippic tower, and the second wall carried round *outside* the site of the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

of the necessity of the gate of Gennath being *some distance* east of Hippicus. And it is evident, on consideration, that this is what he means, and has been labouring to prove. Yet, at p. 23, he cites Dr. Robinson's words with apparent assent, that "the gate must of course have been quite near to Hippicus:" and again, "there was a gate in the first wall adjacent to Hippicus:" again, lower down, "hard by the Hippic tower:" and more particularly in p. 22, "I come now to the last and most memorable proof of all, that the gate Gennath was near the Hippic tower."—It has just occurred to us, that possibly this last passage may refer to the proof on *Dr. Robinson's* side, in favour of *his* theory, that the two were near. If this be so, we can only say we wish Mr. Williams had expressed himself somewhat differently. We can assure him, that however clearly his argument may be unrolled before his own mind, it has cost us no little labour to follow the sequence and perceive the bearing of all the separate portions. We hope that, in the analysis which we have been giving, we have not misrepresented any part of it.

But for Mr. Williams' own theory. If (as he observes) the course of the valley of the Tyropœon can be ascertained, the position of Acra will be easily determined: he therefore inverts the order of his argument, and addresses himself to the Tyropœon first.

There is, he asserts, "one and *only one* remarkable and well-defined valley passing entirely through the city," to which Dr. Robinson makes frequent allusion, as commencing at the Damascus gate (on the north side of the city), and running in a southern direction to the Pool of Siloam. He is of opinion that the character of this broad valley answers to the description of the Tyropœon of Josephus—dividing the modern city into two parts, as the Tyropœon did the ancient, having on the west the high hill of Zion, and the declivity of a still higher ridge; and on the east a lower hill, which he calls Acra, joined at the south to the Temple Mount. But then, was this the relative situation of Zion and Acra, of Acra and Moriah? Can it be proved that the hill Acra lay north-west of the Temple-mount, and not due west? This question he proceeds to discuss, taking as his groundwork the Scriptural account of some of the porters at the Temple gates (1 Chron. xxvi. 16, seq.), together with a passage in the Antiquities of Josephus descriptive of four gates "in the western quarter" of the Temple. This brings upon the *tapis* the famous causeway of Solomon, and gives him occasion to inform us that "such a causeway, connecting the north-east brow of Zion with the Temple-mount, is distinctly to be seen at this day;" indeed, singularly enough, "the very street which Dr. Robinson repre-

sents as following the bed of the valley of the Tyropœon is carried along the ridge of an artificial mound,—for the mound is clearly artificial, and not accidental, as he imagines." (p. 43.)

It is here, at the junction of this causeway with the Temple-mount, that he would place the gate "Shallecheth,"—*i. e.* according to the Chaldee Paraphrast quoted by Lightfoot, "the gate of the casting up or embankment." Having arrived at this, he goes on, by a felicitous train of reasoning, to prove that the *hill* Acra[7] was not the ridge immediately west of Moriah (for here lay "the suburbs," as the Tyropœon was sometimes called—p. 41), but "lay north of the Temple." This, it appears to us, must be taken to mean *northerly—i. e.*, rather north than west. The description of the hill so lying "exactly answers in other respects, to the account of the hill Acra given by Josephus."

But if this was the position of Acra—the very position, be it remembered—which Dr. R. has assigned to Bezetha—where was "Bezetha, or rather the hill included in Bezetha? for the new city was very extensive, and encompassed the lower city on three sides." The reply is—north of the Temple, exactly where Josephus places it. It is a hill distinct from Acra, not mentioned by Dr. R., lying between it and the valley of the Kedron, covered to this day with ruins and cisterns, and bearing evident traces of having been thickly peopled; its highest point nearly north-east of the summit of Acra. "In approaching the city from the north by the Damascus road," writes Mr. Williams, "the two hills are so distinctly marked, that it is impossible to mistake them, and the correctness of the Jewish historian's language is most clearly proved."

Thus, then, having determined the course of the Tyropœon, and the position of Acra, and answered prospectively an objection touching that of Bezetha, the author returns to the great question on which (as we observed) hinges the whole inquiry into the genuineness of the traditional site of the Holy Sepulchre:—he endeavours to trace out the course of the second wall. To do this with him would lead us into details not easy of comprehension, in the absence of a map or a scale akin to that of the magnificent plan of the town and environs, which accompanies the work, and is copied from that drawn by certain officers of the Royal Engineers. It must suffice to say, that embracing in its course several remains of gateways, "it satisfies every demand of the wall of Josephus." These investigations will be found between the 39th and the 58th pages.

[7] As distinguished from the town about the hill Acra, which was reckoned to the hill.

And, now, how stands the great inquiry of all? Where does it leave the Church of the Holy Sepulchre? In the author's own words we answer:—

"In the angle formed by the first and second wall, 'nigh unto the city,' and 'without the gate,' probably in a 'place where there were gardens' (John xix. 20. 41, Heb. xiii. 2), for the gate Gennath (*i. e.* '*the gate of the gardens*') led into this quarter; and where *we know* there were tombs; for the monument of John the high priest was in the angle which was described by that fact[8]; and it is surely a wonderful confirmation of the Christian tradition, that these circumstances, incidentally recorded by a Jewish writer with a totally different view, should all concur in showing, not surely the possibility, but even a probability, of its truth. If 'undesigned coincidences' are worth any thing in such arguments, the Holy Sepulchre is justly entitled to the full benefit of these, which it is impossible for scepticism itself to suspect."—vol. ii. p. 59.

Still, though it may have thus been proved to demonstration that the present site of the Holy Sepulchre is such as must have been without the circuit of the ancient city, it may nevertheless be wrongly determined: or the site having been rightly determined in the first instance, may have been transferred at a later period to this place. It becomes therefore needful to adduce evidence for the truth and for the continuity of the tradition; and this is done in the following chapter. Our limits do not permit us to follow the learned and enthusiastic author all through. We must content ourselves with the following hints as to the course he adopts.

First of all it is obvious to remark, that if the foregoing "attempt to determine the position of Acra and the course of the second wall has been successful, the tradition relating to the Holy Sepulchre is much confirmed:" since it is probable "that a fictitious site would have been fixed far enough away from the ruins of the ancient city, to obviate those apparently strong objections" which arise from its proximity. Moreover, "the very name assigned to the place where our Lord suffered, would tend to preserve the memorial of the site among the natives:" for is it to be supposed, when we remember that this name was universally received in our Saviour's time, and recorded by the Evange-

[8] This most important fact is proved by the following passages in the fifth book of the Jewish War, vi. 2; vii. 3; ix. 2; xi. 4. The monument mentioned was no doubt a *tomb* (as Herod's monument, Helena's monument, the Fuller's monument, were all tombs). This shows that there were tombs in this part; that they were the tombs of some distinguished persons, such as that of the high priest, and of Joseph of Arimathea, which were handsome monuments, and probably inclosed in gardens.

lists—that the Christian Church had never been absent from Jerusalem above two years, probably—and that all other hills and valleys in the neighbourhood retained their distinctive appellations,—is it to be supposed that that hill, which could not fail to be regarded with the deepest interest, not to say reverence, should have lost its name? Nor would the subsequent attempt of Hadrian, or any other, to obliterate the memorial of our Lord's resurrection, by erecting a temple of Venus over the spot, have any other effect than to perpetuate the tradition of the site;—an observation, which is remarkably confirmed by the fact, that "neither Eusebius, nor any of the writers of that century, imply any difficulty in ascertaining the locality."

"With this strong presumption in favour of a right conclusion, we find the Holy Sepulchre placed exactly where the impugners of the tradition, in accordance with the sacred writers, fix its situation, in reference to the ancient city walls, as far as their course can now be ascertained."—vol. ii. p. 74.

The appearance which the Sepulchre, as it now is, presents, may be thus described:—

"'A grotto above ground,' consisting of two chambers, whereof the outer one, constructed of solid masonry, is called the Chapel of the Angel; while the inner one, entered by a low door, is the very cave hewn out of a rock, where was the tomb of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The spot where the sacred body lay is 'on the right side' of the cave at entering[9], now covered with marble to protect it from injury; the removal of which would probably show a ledge or couch, such as are seen in other ancient tombs, cut in the native rock, and only large enough to admit the body. The tomb was designed by Joseph for his own burial, so that it may have had but one receptacle, as is the case with many other rock graves in the vicinity of the city.

"The Greeks believe that the Holy Sepulchre was formerly a rock grave, excavated in a mountain side, as is probably the case with those *e. g.* in the Valley of Hinnom, but that the whole space about it was, by order of the Empress Helena, reduced to the level of the base of the cave, so that the cave stood erect in the middle of an even ground; that she further cased the four sides externally with marble, so as to give it the appearance of a building; and that the roof of the monolith was then pierced in several places to allow a vent to the smoke of the many lamps which continually burnt within."—vol. ii. pp. 77, 78.

Such is probably the correct account: for the testimony of Eusebius is clear and explicit—Eusebius, a bishop of Palestine, who lived at the time when the Sepulchre was recovered. Of a similar nature is that borne by the Bordeaux pilgrim coeval

[9] Mark xvi. 5; compare John xx. 12.

with Eusebius—by St. Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, a very little later—by A. Placentinus, another pilgrim, two centuries later—by Arculfus, only much more distinct, towards the close of the same century—by the English Saint Willibald, in the following century—by Paschasius Radbertus, in a description which he professes to have taken from the accounts of many travellers of that time, in the ninth century.

Very curious and interesting extracts are likewise given, from the Russian pilgrim, Daniel, who visited Jerusalem in the twelfth century (which passage alone might suffice to establish the identity of the sepulchre of that day with that of earlier times, as regarded its outward features), and from Father Boniface of Ragusa, who was employed by Pope Julius III. in the sixteenth century to superintend the restoration—and lastly, from certain eye-witnesses of the fire which took place in 1808, when the ante-chapel was dreadfully burned, and the chapel erected by the Crusaders on the top of the monolith was entirely consumed; yet the cave itself received not the slightest injury internally. These extracts all unite to prove the continued existence of the native rock within the marble casing.

Thus we have endeavoured to lay before the reader an analysis of the arguments and inductions by which Mr. Williams seeks to support a belief which has come down to us venerable with the hoar of ages; and piously steps forward to rescue from the charge, not merely of pitiful ignorance, but of wilful imposition, the bishops and clergy, and some of the brightest ornaments in the purest days, of the eldest Church in Christendom. And we bid him, God speed! Without pledging ourselves to a complete agreement with deductions founded upon arguments which we have had no opportunity of testing, we need not hesitate to declare that, so far as common sense can aid us, in almost all points where he and Dr. Robinson engage, we think the palm of victory must be awarded to our author—always supposing that citations be correctly made, and local facts truly stated. Nor do we shrink from avowing an antecedent sympathy with one who takes his stand on the side which our English Churchman has espoused, in preference to those who set out—as the American Presbyterian seems to have done—with the *axiom* that ecclesiastical tradition is synonymous with fraud; or who—like his co-religionist of Scotland—while charging a Christian bishop with an impious fabrication, deliberately asserts that primitive Christians were likely to pay more marked honour to the resting-place of their human teachers, than to that grave in which the body of the blessed Saviour had been without seeing corruption[1]; or to

[1] Dr. Wilson, "Lands of the Bible," vol. i.

one, and he (alas, that we should have to speak it!) a professor in one of our own ancient universities, who—while calling the saints and fathers of the *fourth* century "*ignorant* priests"—had the temerity to pronounce dogmatically, after a run of only fifteen days through Palestine, Jerusalem included[2].

For ourselves, we beg to tender to Mr. Williams our earnest thanks for his very valuable work, and to congratulate him on the patience, diligence, research, and piety which he has evidently brought to bear upon a subject of surpassing interest—whether it be viewed in a geographical, historical, or religious aspect. It is with sincere pleasure that, while writing these pages, we have heard of an act which reflects equal credit on him who gives and him who receives. We allude to the following gratifying announcement, which appeared in the "Guardian" newspaper of Sept. 12th:—

"The King of Prussia has presented to the Rev. George Williams, M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge (through his ambassador, the Chevalier Bunsen), the golden medal for science, as a token of his high esteem and appreciation of the important services rendered to the republic of letters by that gentleman, in his interesting work *The Topography of Jerusalem.*"

It would not be right to close this article without saying, that a large portion of the second volume is dedicated to an investigation of the Temple-mount as it was and as it is, as well as to the antiquities without the walls. The volume closes with an interesting account of the inhabitants of modern Jerusalem; and with several long notes, for one of which—on Proselytism in the East, Bishop Gobat and the Malta Protestant College—we wish we had space. We earnestly invite attention to it.

We must not omit to mention the very beautiful chapter, by Professor Willis, on the Architectural History of the Holy Sepulchre. And we would express a hope that Mr. W. will consider over our suggestion in p. 180.

[2] Dr. E. D. Clarke. He fell into the monstrous absurdity of placing Mount Zion south of the Valley of Hinnom.

Art. X.—1. *An Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Church of England upon Absolution. By the Rev.* William Maskell, *M.A., Vicar of St. Mary Church, and Domestic Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Exeter.* London: William Pickering. 1849.

2. *The Ministry of the Word for Absolution, according to the Doctrine of the Church of England since the Reformation. In reply to the Rev. W. Maskell's Doctrine of Absolution. By the Rev.* Charles Warren, *M.A., Vicar of Over, Cambridgeshire.* London: Hamilton and Adams. 1849.

The question treated in these publications is one altogether of considerable difficulty, and yet of great practical importance, as all questions relating to absolution must necessarily be. The effect of the absolutions in the daily service and the office for the Holy Communion, may not in itself at first sight appear to comprise so many subjects of inquiry as it really does; but Mr. Maskell has thrown a new light on the subject in his sermon, followed up by the able publication mentioned at the head of this Article, on which it is our purpose to make some comments.

The excessive evils resulting in many ways from the practice of enforced confession which had prevailed for some centuries before the Reformation, induced the abolition of that practice as a necessary preliminary to the reception of the Holy Sacrament, though it was still left optional in the case of any person whose conscience was troubled and who required further comfort or counsel, and the benefit of special absolution. The canons of the Church also recognize and sanction the practice of confessing sins to the minister of God, with a view to spiritual comfort by the same means. Jewell, Hooker, and, we may say, all our divines, concur in affirming that the Church permits and authorizes the practice, though she does not, like the Church of Rome, make it compulsory; and Mr. Maskell agrees with this view, while he states his full conviction that the Church of England has done well and wisely in suppressing the practice of compulsory confession. The following passage conveys Mr. Maskell's view on this part of the subject:—

"In this place I must say that it is no part of my duty now to defend the truth which our Church insists upon, namely, that priestly absolution is not necessary to salvation; and, therefore, that oral confession is not obligatory upon all her members. It must be enough for me to declare

my entire and unhesitating acceptance of this, her decision: nor that alone; I would express also, with all humility, my deep conviction that the removal of the old rule, and the return to ancient practice in this respect, was one great and chief blessing of the Reformation.

"Quite in accordance, therefore, with Holy Scripture, and with catholic tradition, is the statement that God 'pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent, and unfeignedly believe his holy Gospel.' Excellent is the admonition which succeeds the pronunciation of this statement: 'Let us beseech Him to grant us true repentance and his Holy Spirit, that those things may please Him which we do at this present; and that the rest of our life hereafter may be pure and holy.' Most true do I believe it to be, that if returning sinners would once again be accepted of God, would once again 'come' before Him 'holy and clean,' they may with all confidence rely upon the 'way and means thereto,'—alone and without other means,—which our Church has set before them; that is, 'to examine their lives and conversations by the rule of God's commandments; and whereinsoever they shall have perceived themselves to have offended, either by will, word, or deed, there to bewail their own sinfulness, and to confess themselves to Almighty God, with full purpose of amendment of life.'

"And once more: fully do I accept, and with God's help, most plainly would I always endeavour to urge and to insist upon this truth also,—that, without any resort at all to priestly absolution, without receiving it, without desiring it, 'if we have sinned, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous.' If, therefore, we return to Him, who is the merciful receiver of all true penitent sinners, we may assure ourselves that He is ready to receive us, and most willing to pardon us, if we come unto Him with faithful repentance, if we submit ourselves unto Him, and from henceforth walk in his ways; if we will take his easy yoke, to follow Him in lowliness, patience, and charity, and be ordered by the governance of his Holy Spirit, seeking always His glory, and serving Him duly in our vocation with thanksgiving. This if we do, Christ will deliver us from the curse of the law, and He will set us on his right hand, and give us the gracious benediction of his Father, commanding us to take possession of his glorious kingdom. These are indeed golden words; they are words, I humbly and heartily believe, founded, to their full extent, and in their obvious and honest meaning, upon the word of God itself, and the primitive teaching of the Church."—pp. 151—153.

This passage states the author's full conviction that the Church of England held sacerdotal absolution not to be essential to the remission of sin; and that she is right in so holding and teaching.

The particular point, however, made by Mr. Maskell is this,—that, although remission of sins may be obtained by other means besides the absolution of the authorized minister, that absolution,

when it is given, must always be preceded by special confession of sin made to him; and, therefore, that a *general* confession of sin made in and with the congregation, as it is in the daily service and the Holy Communion, is not such a confession as entitles those who make it to receive absolution; and that, in point of fact, the absolution in those services is not, properly speaking, an absolution, but a declaration of God's willingness to forgive, or else a prayer for the forgiveness of the penitent. We think that this is a fair representation of Mr. Maskell's view on the point. It is comprised in the following passage:—

"So far as I am able to comprehend the teaching of our Church, she holds the grace of absolution to be given, and to be given only, to the true penitent after a distinct confession by word of mouth of all known and remembered sins: such confession to be made to a priest, not for the purpose of asking counsel and advice, but in order to receive absolution through his ministry.

"Hence the third form in our office for the Visitation of the Sick, and the absolution contemplated and advised in the exhortation which follows the appointed notice of Communion, alone convey and assure the grace of sacramental absolution, because they alone fulfil the required conditions. If this position be true, then, as to the other two forms which are contained in our Common Prayer-Book, it is, comparatively, of no great consequence to examine very minutely into the extent of the spiritual graces which commonly accompany them. More than a declaration of comfort and consolation, by an authoritative assurance of the infinite mercy of God towards all who repent and amend their lives, with an exhortation so to amend, the first so-called absolution does not appear to be. Nor do I know that the second absolution, that, namely, which is in the Liturgy, although it may convey remission of venial sin, can in any important particular whatever be regarded as more than an earnest supplication to God for mercy towards all who are then present," &c.—pp. 44, 45.

After perusing this passage, we are naturally led to inquire, On what *authority* the statement is made, that the doctrine of the Church of England is as Mr. Maskell describes it? The doctrine appears to us novel, at least if we take into account those writers who have lived since the Reformation; and we are not aware that any such writer has been produced by Mr. Maskell as holding exactly his view. Certainly ritualists may be pointed out who hold the absolutions in the daily service and the Communion to be declarations, and not authoritative absolutions; and, doubtless, writers may also be found who maintain that the absolution in the Visitation of the Sick, and in private confession, is strictly authoritative, and an exercise of the power of the keys. But we do not recollect to have observed authorities subsequent to the

Reformation who have taught that, in order to obtain absolution from a priest, it is absolutely necessary to have previously made a special confession to him.

Mr. Maskell himself, when he comes to examine the evidence of writers subsequent to the Reformation, says that "there is a difficulty in referring to the works of theologians shortly after the Reformation, whether we appeal to them in support of, or against, previous confession, in order to the full grace of sacerdotal absolution; namely, it is a point which scarcely seems to have come before them" (p. 130). And on examining the various passages which he quotes afterwards, it seems to us, that they do not establish *this* point; but assert the lawfulness of confession and absolution, or deny that the Church of England has entirely rejected either. The only strong passage is an extract from Archbishop Cranmer's Catechism, in which those who sin after baptism are exhorted to go to God's ministers, and confess and receive absolution from them.

The great strength of Mr. Maskell's argument, however, as regards authority, is made to rest on the doctrine of the Church of England *previously* to the Reformation; and here it cannot be doubted that his case is made out very clearly. On this point we shall have to offer some remarks hereafter. But in the mean time we have to observe, that even supposing Mr. Maskell were able to establish by sufficient authorities that in order to a special absolution addressed to an individual, a special confession of sin is necessary, still it does not seem to us to follow, that a *general absolution* may not be given, and be a valid exercise of the power of the keys, when a *general confession* has been made. We will admit to Mr. Maskell that if a penitent comes to a priest soliciting him to pronounce forgiveness of his sins, that priest should endeavour to ascertain in the first instance that he is truly penitent, and may take all reasonable methods to ascertain that the fact is so, by exhortation, instruction, and inquiry. If a penitent comes to have his spiritual wound healed by the advice and exhortations, and prayers, and absolution of the minister of God, he should not conceal from that minister the state of his heart and life, more especially in those points which burden his conscience. Such communication is authorized and supposed in the exhortation to Holy Communion, in the Visitation of the Sick, and in the canons, as a pre-requisite to special absolution. But then this seems to furnish no argument against the validity of an absolution given generally to the congregation, on their general confession. The question is, May not the power of the keys—the power of binding and loosing—be exercised in such an act just as effectively as it is in special absolutions?

We may, therefore, lay aside almost wholly the authorities which Mr. Maskell has accumulated in proof of his position; for they all go to establish that, in order to receive what is called sacramental absolution, *i. e.* to receive special remission of sins, previous special confession of sins to the person pronouncing the absolution is requisite. But there are other absolutions, which were not reckoned as *sacramental*, *i. e.* as not given in the rite of private confession and absolution, and yet which have always been recognized in the Church, as an exercise of the power of the keys in binding and loosing. We allude to absolutions given by synods, and by bishops in their consistories and elsewhere; and other formal and public absolutions, not given in what Roman Catholics call "the tribunal of penance," *i. e.* not in private, and after secret confession. Now if these be an exercise of the power of the keys—if they be true and real absolutions, it does seem to us that Mr. Maskell's argument from the general principles and practice of the Church prior to the Reformation, is not tenable; and that there is no authority for maintaining that, in order to receive "the grace of absolution," a special confession must, in all cases, be made to a priest. In reference to the question how far the absolution in the daily and Communion service is to be regarded in the light which Mr. Maskell, and which the divines of the Church of Rome also regard such absolutions in the public service, namely, as mere prayers or forms which do not comprise any exercise of the power of the keys, but at the utmost may possibly avail to obtain pardon for trifling faults or "venial sins," we would quote the following words of Hooker, which certainly do not support that view:—

"First, seeing day by day we in our Church begin our public prayers to Almighty God with public acknowledgment of our sins, in which confession every man, prostrate as it were before His Glorious Majesty, crieth guilty against himself; and the minister with one sentence pronounceth universally all clear, when acknowledgment so made, hath proceeded from a true penitent mind; what reason is there every man should not under the general terms of confession, represent unto himself his own particulars whatsoever, and adjoining thereunto that affection which a contrite spirit worketh, embrace to as full effect the words of divine grace, as if the same were severally and particularly uttered with addition of prayers, imposition of hands, or all the ceremonies and solemnities that might be used for the strengthening of man's affiance in God's peculiar mercy towards them? Such complements are helps to support our weakness, and not causes that serve to procure or produce the gifts. If with us there be truth in the inward parts, as David speaketh, the difference of *general and particular forms* in confession and absolution is not so material, that any man's

safety or ghostly good should depend on it."—*Hooker*, book vi. ch. iv. 15, ed. Keble.

We quote this passage, not only as carrying with it considerable authority, but as drawing the distinction to which we have adverted, between general and particular absolutions, and acknowledging the validity of both.

The truth is, that if we look to the terms of our Lord's commission to his Apostles, in which the power of the keys, and of remitting and retaining sins, is conveyed, we do not find any thing to warrant us in asserting, that the power thus conferred can only be exercised in private confession and absolution. Will any one deny that it was fully exercised, when, after public and formal penance for sins in the Church, public absolution was given to numerous penitents together? Will any Romanist, even, deny that the power of the keys, given to the Apostles by our Lord, is not exercised when the pope, or when some authorized ecclesiastical tribunal, imparts by formal sentence absolution to bodies of persons who have transgressed, on their penitence? The papal bulls contain grants of *indulgence*, which is considered as an exercise of the same power given in the words referred to, to *all persons* who perform certain conditions, or execute certain works. We adduce such well-known facts as these to show that we have no right arbitrarily to limit the exercise of the grace of remission in the ministry, to the single case of private confession; and we adduce them also, as furnishing a sufficient reply to the mass of authorities quoted by Mr. Maskell, from authorities *prior* to the Reformation. Even the Latin Church never held the principle, that the power of the keys is only exercised in the sacrament of penance; and, therefore, let it be ever so clearly proved, that in order to the integrity of that sacrament, a special confession was previously necessary, not a step will have been gained, to show that absolution cannot be given by God's ministers except in that rite.

Now, if this be so, we think the weight of authority is at once in favour of the opinion which Mr. Maskell argues against. For the simple fact, that the Church of England herself *calls* the forms in the daily and Communion service "*Absolution*," is, in itself, in our mind, a sufficient proof that she *regards* them as absolutions. Mr. Maskell holds that they are *improperly* called Absolutions. We think that in this, Mr. Maskell labours at a great disadvantage. We should not hastily assume that the Church of England does not mean what she says.

Mr. Warren, in the publication which we have mentioned at the head of this article, states the argument from authority in the

Church of England, since the Reformation, with much clearness and force. He begins thus :—

"The first point on which I rest is, that in 1549, our Reformers retained an Absolution in the Communion Office as a proper Absolution, not as an ordinary prayer. This I shall endeavour to show (when we come to that form), and think that I shall be able to prove. At this time therefore (when they made auricular confession no longer compulsory), they also must have relinquished the tenet that a special confession is necessary to the receiving the grace of sacerdotal Absolution. It may not be amiss to put, in order, the three several views now laid before the reader.

"The Church of England, before 1549, taught, first, that a distinct oral confession is necessary to the receiving sacerdotal Absolution; secondly, that sacerdotal Absolution is necessary to salvation, whence, consistently, auricular confession was compulsory. Mr. Maskell asserts that the Church has only denied the second, which makes auricular no longer compulsory. To allow the efficacy of a general Absolution, we must deny the first, and this, I maintain, the Church has done."

The following passage contains a strong confirmation of the view above stated :—

"In James I.'s time, we read in a 'note of such things as shall be reformed,' appended to *Dr. Montague's Narrative of the Second Day's Conference*—'The Absolution shall be called, the Absolution, or general Remyssion of Sins.' And in *Barlow's Account*—'Next in order was the point of Absolution, which the Lord Archbishop cleared from all abuse or superstition, as it is used in our Church of England; reading unto his Majesty both the Confession, in the beginning of the Communion Book, and the Absolution, following it; wherein, saith he, the Minister doth nothing else but pronounce an Absolution in general. His Highness perused them both, in the book itself, liking and approving them, finding it to be very true which my Lord Archbishop said. But the Bishop of London, stepping forward, added: It becometh us to deal plainly with your Majesty; there is also, in the Communion Book, another more particular and personal form of Absolution, prescribed to be used in the order for the Visitation of the Sick. This the King required to see; and while Master Dean of the Chapel was turning to it, the said Bishop alleged, that not only the Confessions of Augustin, Boheme, Saxon, which he there cited, do retain and allow it; but that Master Calvin also did approve such a general kind of Confession and Absolution as the Church of England useth, and withal did very well like of those which are private, for so he terms them. The said particular Absolution in the Common Prayer Book being read, his Majesty exceedingly well approved it, &c. The conclusion was, that it should be consulted of by the Bishops, whether, unto the Rubric of the general Absolution, these words, Remission of Sins, might not be added, for explanation' sake.' I do not know that any other explanation of this addition can be given, than the Bishops did it, in order to mark the

difference between our Absolution and the Romish Absolution of the Sacrament of Penance; and at the same time, to show their belief that the Absolution is effectual to the Remission of Sins. It had been objected that Absolution was like the Pope's pardons. The new name would refer men to the new and better doctrine. But if the Absolution were regarded only as an appropriate prayer of no higher order than the other prayers of the service, I do not see how this new title could be applied to it. Whatever argument can fairly be drawn from a name, is against Mr. Maskell's hypothesis."

The same view is confirmed by the position taken by the bishops in the Savoy Conference, which is well worthy of notice:—

"It is necessary to notice the substitution of the word Priest for Minister, in certain editions of the Prayer Book. 'On an examination of the editions belonging to that period, it is found that the words were used as if no distinct meanings were assigned to them. The editions of 1607 and 1627 have 'Minister.' The form of prayer for the fast in 1625, and the Prayer Books of 1632 and 1633, have 'Priest;' but the editions of 1634 and 1639 again have the word 'Minister.'' *Cardwell Con.* 237. At the Savoy Conference, the Nonconformists desired that, as the word Minister, and not Priest or Curate, is used in the Absolution and in divers other places, it may, throughout the whole book, be used instead of those two words; and it was answered, 'It is not reasonable that the word Minister should be only used in the Liturgy. For since some parts of the Liturgy may be performed by a Deacon, others by none under the order of a Priest, viz. Absolution, Consecration, it is fit that some such word as Priest should be used for their offices.' And in the revision of the Liturgy which followed, the Absolution was ordered to be pronounced by the Priest alone, instead of the Minister.

"Now, regarding the use of the word Minister, even the passages before quoted from *Jewel's Apology and Defence*, would make it appear that the word, when standing alone, and without any thing to extend its meaning, was taken at that time to signify, Priest. But Nicholls, in his book on the Common Prayer, has shown that this was the case, quoting from the *Lambeth Council*, '*Ministri Ecclesiæ*,' (*Tit. de Informatione Parochianorum;*) and *Lyndwood's Gloss*, '*Ministri. Hoc intelligas de iis quibus regimen plebis est commissum;*' as elsewhere, '*Minister ponitur pro rectore vel gubernatore.*'

"At the time of the Savoy Conference the word had changed its meaning. Although, therefore, Minister could never be fairly interpreted otherwise than Minister of Absolution, *i. e.* the Priest; still the meaning was considered to be uncertain, and there were variations in the books.

"In such a case the Bishops are a competent authority, and they ruled that the form shall be used by the Priest alone, inasmuch as Absolution is committed to him. If the Absolution were merely an appropriate address, they would have ruled that a Deacon might pronounce it."

The result of this argument is stated by Mr. Warren to be, that the Church of England, as soon as she had been set free from the errors which had been mixed up with the doctrine of absolution in former times, appointed a form in her daily service, which she entitled an Absolution, and which she explained to mean a "remission of sins," obviously assuming it to be an exercise of the power of the keys; that she afterwards carefully restricted the use of this form to priests, on the principle that absolution belongs exclusively to them, and not to deacons; that she altered her rubric in order to meet this view at a time when the meaning of words was changing; and that she refused to omit the words "remission of sins," and to throw the office open to deacons in the time of King William, when certain persons who denied the efficacy of sacerdotal absolution, were desirous to induce her so to do; and he thus concludes:—

"We have then, I argue, the authority of our Church for maintaining that while a distinct and special confession is necessary for the priest even to entertain the question of administering a private absolution, the benefit of sacerdotal absolution may, nevertheless, be obtained by the truly penitent, upon a general confession in the public ordinances of the Church. And this is, in such manner, left to the knowledge and mercy of the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the carefulness and conscience of the penitent."—p. 57.

In conclusion, we must be permitted to offer some remarks on the principle on which the appeal to authority in Mr. Maskell's work is conducted. The authority to which he appeals is the doctrine of the Latin Church, and especially of the Church of England for three centuries immediately prior to the Reformation; and he argues that whatever had been received in the Church of England up to that period, and was not then expressly, or by implication, rejected by any of the formularies of the Church, should be held to be still the doctrine of the Church. His words are as follows:—

"We declare therefore that the Church of England now holds, teaches, and insists upon all things, whether of belief or practice, which she held, taught, and insisted on, before the year 1540, unless she has since that time, plainly, openly, and dogmatically, asserted the contrary. This we declare in general. And, in particular, as regards that most important question, the right interpretation of the various services in our Common Prayer Book, we further add, that whatever we find handed down from the earlier rituals of the Church of England, and neither limited nor extended in its meaning by any subsequent canon or article, must be understood to signify (upon the one hand) fully and certainly all, and on the other hand no more than it signified before the revision of the ritual."—p. 49.

Now, this is certainly, a very important principle; and to our view, somewhat a novel one. We do not find any such principle laid down in any of our formularies, or in the writings of our divines. We are therefore at a loss for any sufficient foundation for such a doctrine. The Church of England has not made any such assertion; and before members of the English Church can be expected to accept it, they must have some proof that it is a sound and a true principle. Before we can be required to receive it as members of the Church, we must learn where the Church has taught it. And, in the next place, we certainly do find in the Homilies strong condemnations of the errors prevalent in the Church for the last few centuries, while the Canons refer us for the interpretation of Scripture, not to the opinions of more recent times, but to the interpretations of the Fathers. The account given in the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, of the state of Rituals previously to the Reformation—the condemnation of doctrines in the Articles—the very fact of a Reformation having been necessary—are all so many proofs, that there might be good reason for not laying down such a principle as that asserted by Mr. Maskell. It might, possibly, embarrass the Church, and lead to false doctrine and unsound practice on various points, if we were to assume, that every thing which had not been formally and dogmatically rejected by the Church of England, is to be assumed to be part of her creed. Is not the omission of a doctrine for 300 years, tantamount to its rejection? Supposing that for such a time we do not find the writers of the English Church asserting, that absolution cannot be obtained without previous confession of all known sins, or maintaining that the absolutions in the daily service and the Communion, are essentially different in their nature from absolutions given after special confession, and are not any exercise of the power of the keys—supposing all this to be the case, does it not afford a fair presumption that the Church does not hold the views on these points which were taught by authority in the Western Church, from the time of the Council of Lateran? Does it not really amount to a virtual condemnation and rejection of that doctrine? To us, we confess, that it does seem so; and that it is therefore impossible to claim the authority of the Church of England since the Reformation in favour of Mr. Maskell's view. We are bound to bear testimony, however, to the ability, clearness, and learning, with which that view has been put forward, and to express great satisfaction in perceiving the respect and deference for the Church of England manifested by this distinguished writer.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS,

ETC.

1. Willmott's Journal of Summer Time in the Country. 2. Harington's Reformation of the Anglican Church, and Macaulay's History of England. With Postscript. 3. Freeman's History of Architecture. 4. Notices of Ancient Parochial and Collegiate Churches of Scotland. 5. The Ecclesiastical and Architectural Topography of England. 6. Hardwick's Historical Enquiry touching St. Catherine of Alexandria. 7. Baxter's Church History of England. 8. Prichard's Life and Times of Hincmar, Archbp. of Rheims. 9. Dr. Kitto's Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature abridged. 10. Der gute Gerhard von Köln. A Tale, by Carl Simrock. 11. Capt. Marryatt's Valerie. 12. Use and Abuse; a Tale. 13. Eamonson's Observations on Goode's Doctrine of the Church of England as to Baptism. 14. Barter's Solemn Warning against the Doctrine of Special Grace. 15. Ruskin's Seven Lamps of Architecture. 16. Dowling's Natural History of Quadrupeds and Birds. 17. Russell's Ancient Knight. 18. Anderson's Addresses on Miscellaneous Subjects. 19. Bp. Hobart's Companion to the Altar, by Collingwood.

1.—*A Journal of Summer Time in the Country. By the Rev.* Robert Aris Willmott, *Incumbent of Bear Wood, Berks; Author of "Jeremy Taylor's Biography."* London: J. W. Parker.

There is, perhaps, nothing in which the revolutionary character of modern times is more strongly marked than in the change which has passed over our literary style. Compare, for instance, the clear and simple narrative of Hume, or the lofty phraseology of Johnson or Gibbon, with the brilliancy of Macaulay or of Elliot Warburton, and what a wonderful change do we see! In the style of the present day, point, antithesis, poetical imagery, variety, originality, and novelty of expression are the grand characteristics; corresponding, in fact, to the altered tone of society and conversation, which exhibits exactly the same features. In the present day an educated man who expects to shine in society must be at home on every conceivable subject of art, literature, science, politics, literary history; and must be able to handle them all with an air of the most consummate mastery—to play with them as if he were an intellectual giant—to turn from grave to gay, and from the profoundest depths of philosophy and theology to a witticism or a stanza. Is it not strange that with so much accomplishment, we have so little solidity of sense, or so little fixedness of principle? Notwithstanding all our brilliancy and thoughtfulness—(and we bid fair to rival France and Germany in

these respects)—we, somehow or other, do not produce as great men as we used to do in more dull and unphilosophical times. The march of education has given us a number of men who, to say the least, are quite as remarkable for a thorough satisfaction with their own capacities and judgments, as for any thing else. And now, having made these prefatory remarks, we will not do Mr. Willmott the injustice of including him amongst the class of persons to whom we have alluded, though our remarks have been suggested by the perusal of his work. It is decidedly, however, a work of the present day, in most of the respects above mentioned; being a brilliant, ingenious, grave, sad, agreeable, poetical, witty, philosophical, theological, humorous, scientific, æsthetic, conglomerate. The author is a literary butterfly, at once in the brilliancy of his tints, and the variety of his evolutions. He speeds in zig-zag course from flower to flower, scarcely spending time enough on each to extract a drop of honey. He is an epicure who will not be satisfied with any thing but the choicest tit-bits, and whose appetite is palled by any thing more than a taste of each in succession.

The volume comprises a journal supposed to be kept during the summer months, in which the author enters all the results of his discursive reading from day to day, accompanied with thoughts derived from the impressions made by rural scenery or events. We are bound to say that the volume is, to us, a very pleasing one, though there is rather too much pretension in the whole conception and execution, and we do not feel satisfied at the spirit of the day which influences the tone and style of productions like this. The object of the work may be in some degree comprehended from the following extracts:—

"Few men of genius have taken the trouble of recording their feelings or studies. One or two precious legacies have perished by accident or design. But where the full light is wanting, an unexpected illumination frequently breaks over a character from a passage in the published works of the author. A page of the journal is broken up, and melted into the poem or essay. Shakespeare's sonnets are a chapter of autobiography, although unreadable till criticism finds the key. Raffaelle's drawings were his diary; Shenstone's garden his confessions. Cowper's letters and Wordsworth's poetry reflect the features of these writers as face answers to face in water.

"The notion of a journal implies variety. Gray confessed that his reading wandered from Pausanias to Pindar; mixing Aristotle and Ovid like bread with cheese. He might have sheltered himself under a noble example. Lord Bacon considered it necessary to contract and dilate the mind's eyesight; regarding the interchange of splendour and gloom as essential to the health of the organ. The reader may test

the rule by trying it on his natural eyes. In a gorgeous summer day let him come suddenly from a thick screen of branches, turning his face towards the sun, and then to the grass. Every blade will be reddened, as if a fiery procession had gone by. The colour is not in the grass, but in the eye; as that contracts, the glare vanishes.

"Subject the mental sight to a similar experiment. After wandering in the dim recesses of history or metaphysics, let the inward eye be lifted to the broad, central, glowing orbs of Shakespeare, Milton, or Hooker, and immediately cast down upon the common surface of daily life. Objects become hazy and discoloured; the dilation of the nerve of thought dazzles and bewilders the vision. It is wise, therefore, to familiarize the seeing faculty of the understanding to different degrees of lustre. Sunshine and twilight should temper one another. Despise nothing. After Plato take up Reid; closing Dante, glance at Wharton; from Titian walk away to K. du Jardin.

"If a letter be conversation upon paper, a journal is a dialogue between the writer and his memory. Now he grows red with Horace, scolding the innkeeper because the bad water had taken away his appetite; and before the strife of tongues has subsided, he sits down with Shakespeare under a chestnut-tree in Sir Thomas Lucy's park. Thoughts must ever be the swiftest travellers, and sighs are not the only things wafted 'from Indus to the pole' in an instant."—pp. 4—6.

To give an account of the contents of a work so multifarious as that before us would be impossible; but we must select a few specimens.

"It is delicious now to creep under the scented copse——
—— the green woodside along,

until you steal on the leafy haunt of the woodlark. There is love in this idleness. I know that formal John Wesley put a brand on it: 'Never be unemployed, never be triflingly employed, never while away time.' Such an admonition might be expected from one of whom Johnson left this character: 'John Wesley's conversation is good, but he is never at leisure; he is always obliged to go at a certain hour.' When Lord Collingwood said, that a young person should not be allowed to have two books at the same time, he fell into a similar error of judgment. The blackbird, that pipes in the warm leaves before my window, is a witness against the preacher and admiral. He is tired of the lime-bough, and is finishing his song in an apple-branch that swings him further into the sun. He wanted a change. Then what is whiling away time? When Watt sat in the chimney-corner, observing the water force up the cover of the saucepan, he aroused the anger of his relations, but he was discovering the steam-engine. Sir Walter Scott, walking one day by the banks of the Yarrow, found Mungo Park, the traveller, earnestly employed in casting stones into the stream, and watching the bubbles that followed their descent. 'Park, what is it that engages your attention?' asked Sir Walter. 'I

was thinking how often I had thus tried to sound the rivers in Africa, by calculating the time that elapsed before the bubbles rose to the surface.' 'Then,' said Scott, 'I know that you think of returning to Africa.' 'I do, indeed,' was the reply; 'but it is yet a secret.' Such is the idleness of genius."—pp. 7, 8.

In truth this *is* a charming book, after all. We are fairly beaten out of our moralizing vein by the many beauties that meet our eye in perusing it. There is not a page that is dull or uninteresting; and we have been tempted to "while away" a good deal of time over its contents. We recommend our readers not to lay it aside if they come across it: indeed, we believe such a recommendation is altogether needless.

II.—*The Reformation of the Anglican Church, and Mr. Macaulay's History of England. By* E. C. Harington, *A.M., Chancellor of the Cathedral Church of Exeter.* London: Rivingtons.

A Postscript to the same. Rivingtons.

The Reformation of the Church of England is assailed from so many different quarters as to show the high importance of the question. Romanists, Romanizers, Unitarians, Rationalists, Sectarians, and "Liberals" of all denominations, are bent on fastening various accusations on the Reformers, with a view to degrade them, and, through them, the Church of England. The character of Archbishop Cranmer, and of the principal religious agents in the Reformation, is of importance to the Church of England: if it were not so, there would not be such continual attempts to blacken them. We may readily admit, that the leaders of the Reformation in England were fallible men—we cannot recognize them as the first teachers of our religion, or look on them as inspired; and yet, we do not think that Churchmen can with safety or with justice permit their characters to be run down, and adopt the views of them which the enemies of our faith are anxious to inculcate.

What may be Mr. Macaulay's religious profession, we know not; but we do know that his work is full of most insidious attacks upon the Church of England. From beginning to end, no opportunity is lost for representing it in the most unfavourable point of view. Hence, brilliant as is the eloquence of his work, it is one which no Churchman can recommend as a faithful and just portraiture. It is the writing of a partizan in opposition to the English Church. Its tone is like that of the Infidels and Rationalists of the present day in reference to the Church—a mixture of contempt and hatred. Mr. Chancellor Harington has

done excellent service in calling attention to Macaulay's treatment of the Reformers. His pamphlet is directed very much to a vindication of the memory of Cranmer and the Reformers from certain imputations cast on them by Macaulay. Accordingly, after quoting certain passages in which it is asserted that "the founders of the Anglican Church" held the most extreme Erastian views, denied the divine institution of Episcopacy, and "retained it merely as an ancient, decent, and convenient ecclesiastical polity," Mr. Harington states the object of his pages as follows:

"My object in the following pages will be to show, that these assertions as regards Cranmer and the other Reformers, are not in accordance with historical testimony; that Mr. Macaulay has limited his enquiries into the views of the Archbishop and the 'founders of the Anglican Church,' to the year 1540, whereas in Treatises, so early as 1537, and subsequently in 1543, 1548, 1551, and 1552, Cranmer distinctly disavowed Erastian views, defended the Divine institution of Episcopacy, supported Apostolical succession, and maintained the necessity of Episcopal ordination for the due administration of the Sacraments; whilst the framers of our Liturgy and Ordinal, have not, as far as I am aware, advanced any opinions which would justify Mr. Macaulay's imputations."—p. 7.

Mr. Harington very properly remarks on the expression, "founders of the Anglican Church," that it is "rather difficult to ascertain the exact parties to whom Mr. Macaulay refers." To speak of the Reformers as "*founders* of the Anglican Church" is an incorrectness which, we fear, is not unintentional in this instance. The pamphlet before us then enters on a very satisfactory and ably conducted criticism of those passages in Mr. Macaulay's history which refer to the English Reformation, and demonstrates their incorrectness by an appeal to authentic documents. Space prevents our following the author through the details of this exposure; but we may form some estimate of its value on learning, that in subsequent editions of Macaulay's history the passages which were criticized in the pamphlet before us have been materially modified and altered, without, however, any acknowledgment of previous error. These alterations in detail, which are evidently due to Mr. Harington's able and timely protest, cannot, of course, alter the *spirit* of the work in which they have been made. The Postscript to Mr. Harington's pamphlet contains a very satisfactory reply to certain objections against the pamphlet.

III.—*The History of Architecture.* By EDWARD FREEMAN, *M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.* London: Masters.

THIS work takes a wider range on the subject of architecture than any that has come under our observation. It includes the history not only of Christian, but of classical and heathen architecture. In fact, the author has extended his researches to all countries in which architectural remains exist. It may be supposed that so very extensive a subject can scarcely be treated in a very satisfactory way within the compass of a single volume; but we can only say, that in all those parts of the work which we have perused, we have found accurate information, research, and scientific views of the subject.

IV.—*Descriptive Notices of some of the Ancient Parochial and Collegiate Churches of Scotland.* London: J. H. Parker.

IT is a matter of some surprise to find, that after the reign of Presbyterianism for so lengthened a period in Scotland, so many interesting churches still remain in that country. It seems from the work before us, that they are, in almost all cases, either of a very early or of a very late date; church building having apparently been almost entirely intermitted during the thirteenth, fourteenth, and part of the fifteenth centuries. In this curious and interesting work there are a variety of details of the Scottish Churches, which appear in many cases to present very peculiar features. The Flamboyant style seems to have been partially introduced in some of the later buildings, probably in consequence of the intercourse between Scotland and France. This publication is a valuable accession to our architectural knowledge.

V.—*The Ecclesiastical and Architectural Topography of England. Published under the sanction of the Central Committee of the Archæological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland.* Oxford and London: J. H. Parker.

THIS publication, of which we have seen one part, containing an account of the churches in Berkshire, will be a valuable record of the state of parochial churches at the present day, and will be useful to students in directing their attention to examples in their own neighbourhood, in which the various styles can be advantageously studied. The work would, we think, possess more interest and value if it entered somewhat more into antiquarian detail. It is at present rather dry.

VI.—*An Historical Enquiry touching Saint Catherine of Alexandria: to which is added a Semi-Saxon Legend. By* CHARLES HARDWICK, *M.A., Fellow and Chaplain of St. Catherine's Hall, Cambridge.* Cambridge: Deightons; London: J. W. Parker; Oxford: J. H. Parker.

THIS Essay is one of the publications of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society, and contains a most learned and curious investigation of the life, legends, and worship of S. Catherine. It appears very uncertain whether she was known in England prior to the Norman conquest. Her worship probably came in with the Normans, having been introduced in the tenth century in the West. Mr. Hardwick has invested his subject with far more interest than could have been anticipated, and appears to have executed his work, as Editor of the Semi-Saxon Legend, with very great care and ability. Such a work as this reflects credit on the Society from which it has emanated.

VII.—*The Church History of England: from the Introduction of Christianity into Britain to the Present Time. By* JOHN A. BAXTER, *M.A., Perpetual Curate of Christ Church, Coseley.* Second Edition. London: Hatchards.

THERE is much in this work that we like (from what we have seen of it), and much that we do *not* like. The style is flowing and vigorous, and the book, though comprising so large a range, is not a dry narrative of facts, but is enlivened by appropriate remarks, inferences, &c. Indeed, we are of opinion that the author has allowed his pen too much liberty in the latter respect, and has permitted his own views on various points to enter rather too largely into the composition. The author is an earnest Protestant, and is keenly alive to the blessings of the Reformation; but we think that his views are not exactly those of the Reformation itself: it seems to us that they are formed on the later doctrines of religious liberty; and while there is much impartiality throughout his history, it is by no means without exceptions. We will not say that the author is exactly in accordance with such writers as Mr. Goode, of St. Antholin's. But there is a considerable infusion of the same kind of thing in his volume.

VIII.—*The Life and Times of Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims. By the late Rev.* JAMES C. PRICHARD, *M.A., Vicar of Mitcham, and formerly Fellow of Oriel College.* Littlemore: Masson; London: J. H. Parker.

FROM the brief survey which we have taken of this volume, it

appears to us to be one of the most valuable contributions to Ecclesiastical History that we have seen. The author, whose early death the Church has to deplore, was one who probably might have supplied us with a readable Church history. His views are of such a complexion as would have rendered a more extended work from his pen really beneficial to the Church. The volume before us is intended for the general reader, not for the professed critic; and accordingly it bases itself, with perfect propriety, on the researches of previous labourers in the same field, though original documents have been consulted in the more important cases. In perusing part of the work, we have been much struck by the details which it gives of the mode of appointing bishops under the Carlovingian dynasty in France, at a time when bishops were in possession of quite as great emoluments and privileges as any that they have ever enjoyed since. We refer to p. 520, &c., where it appears that on a vacancy, a royal commissioner, generally a bishop, was appointed to attend the election, the electors being the cathedral and parochial priests, and all laymen of noble or free birth; and the election being examined and confirmed by the metropolitan and all the bishops of the province. The whole account is well worthy of perusal, and furnishes a most edifying example of the fidelity with which the sovereigns of France performed their duties towards the Church; and how little it was then supposed that the appointment of bishops was a part of the Regal Supremacy,—a power which was exercised as fully by Charlemagne and his successors, as it has been in more modern times by other princes.

IX.—*Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature abridged. By* JOHN KITTO, *D.D., F.S.A., &c.* Edinburgh: Black.

THE work before us is evidently the result of great labour and research; and we have pleasure in recommending it to the notice of the Clergy as a work which is free from the taint of rationalizing principles. The following statement at the conclusion of an able article on "Inspiration" is quite satisfactory on this point:—

"On the whole, after carefully investigating the subject of inspiration, we are conducted to the important conclusion that 'all Scripture is divinely inspired;' that the sacred penmen wrote 'as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;' and that these representations are to be understood as implying that the writers had, in all respects, the effectual guidance of the Divine Spirit. And we are still more confirmed in this conclusion, because we find that it begets in those who seriously adopt it, an acknowledgment of the divine origin of Scripture, a reverence for its teachings, and a practical regard to its requirements, like what ap-

peared in Christ and his Apostles. Being convinced that the Bible has, in all parts, and in all respects, the seal of the Almighty, and that it is truly and existing from God, we are led by reason, conscience, and piety, to bow submissively to its high authority, implicitly to believe its doctrines, however incomprehensible, and cordially to obey its precepts, however contrary to our natural inclinations. We come to it from day to day, not as judges, but as learners, never questioning the propriety or utility of its contents. This precious Word of God is the perfect standard of our faith, and the rule of our life, our comfort in affliction, and our sure guide to heaven."—p. 430.

This is a Christian statement and confession. Those who criticize Scripture as they do any other old book, are evidently Reformers of more than our popular religion: they are Reformers of Christianity itself—of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Apostles. We are tempted to extract the following passage on verbal inspiration :—

"The doctrine of a plenary inspiration of all Scripture in regard to the language employed, as well as the thoughts communicated, ought not to be rejected without valid reasons. The doctrine is so obviously important, and so consonant to the feelings of sincere piety, that those evangelical Christians who are pressed with speculative objections against it, frequently, in the honesty of their hearts, advance opinions which fairly imply it. This is the case, as we have seen, with Dr. Henderson, who says that the Divine Spirit guided the sacred penmen in *writing* the Scriptures; that their *mode of expression* was such as they were instructed by the Spirit to employ; that Paul ascribes not only the doctrines which the Apostles taught, but *the entire character of their style*, to the influence of the Spirit. He indeed says, that this does not always imply the *immediate communication of the words* of Scripture; and he says it with good reason. For *immediate* properly signifies *acting without a medium*, or *without the intervention of another cause or means, not acting by second causes*. Now those who hold the highest views of inspiration do not suppose that the Divine Spirit, except in a few instances, so influenced the writers of Scripture as to interfere with the use of their rational faculties or their peculiar mental habits and tastes, or in any way to supersede secondary causes as the medium through which his agency produced the desired effect.

"In regard to this point, therefore, there appears to be little or no ground for controversy. For, if God so influenced the sacred writers that, either with or without the use of secondary causes, they wrote just *what* he intended, and in the *manner* he intended, the end is secured; and what they wrote is as truly *his word*, as though he had written it with his own hand on the tables of stone, without any human instrumentality. The very words of the decalogue were all such as God chose: and they would have been equally so if Moses had been moved by the Divine Spirit to write them with *his* hand.

The expression, that God *immediately imparted* or *communicated* to the writers the very words which they wrote, is evidently not well chosen. The exact truth is, that *the writers themselves* were the subjects of the Divine influence. The Spirit employed them as active instruments, and directed them in writing, both as to matter and manner. They wrote 'as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.' The matter, in many cases, was what they before knew, and the manner was entirely conformed to their habits; it was *their own*. But what was written was none the less inspired on that account. God may have influenced and guided an Apostle as infallibly in writing what he had before known, and that guidance may have been as really necessary, as in writing a new revelation. And God may have influenced Paul or John to write a book in *his own peculiar style*, and that influence may have been as real and as necessary as if the style had been what some would call a *Divine style*. It *was* a Divine style, if the writer used it under Divine direction: it was a *Divine* style; and it was, at the same time, a *human* style, and the *writer's own* style, all in one. Just as the believer's exercises, faith and love, are his own acts, and at the same time are the effects of Divine influence. The mental exercises of Paul and of John had their own characteristic peculiarities, as much as their style. God was the author of John's mind and all that was peculiar to his mental faculties and habits, as really as of Paul's mind and what was peculiar to him: and in the work of inspiration he used and directed, for his own purposes, what was peculiar to each. When God inspired different men, He did not make their minds and tastes all alike, nor did He make their language alike. Nor had He any occasion for this; for, while they had different mental faculties and habits, they were as capable of being infallibly directed by the Divine Spirit, and infallibly speaking and writing Divine truth, as though their mental faculties and habits had been all exactly alike. And it is manifest that the Scriptures, written by such a variety of inspired men, and each part agreeably to the peculiar talents and style of the writer, are not only equally from God, but, taken together, are far better adapted to the purposes of general instruction, and all the objects to be accomplished by revelation, than if they had been written by one man, and in one and the same manner.

"This view of plenary inspiration is fitted to relieve the difficulties and objections which have arisen in the minds of men from the variety of talent and taste which the writers exhibited, and the variety of style which they used. See, it is said, how each writer expresses himself naturally, in his own way, just as he was accustomed to do when not inspired. And see, too, we might say in reply, how each Apostle, Peter, Paul, or John, when speaking before rulers, with the promised aid of the Holy Spirit, spoke naturally, *with his own voice*, and in his own way, as he had been accustomed to do on other occasions when not inspired. There is no more objection to plenary inspiration in the one case than in the other. The mental faculties and habits of the Apostles, their style, their voice, their mode of speech, all remained as

they were. What, then, had the Divine Spirit to do? What was the work which appertained to Him? We reply, His work was so to direct the Apostles in the use of their own talents and habits, their style, their voice, and all their peculiar endowments, that they should speak or write, each in his own way, just what God would have them speak or write, for the good of the Church in all ages."

x.—*Der gute Gerhard von Köln. Erzählung von* Karl Simrock. *Frankfurt.*—"*Good Gerard of Cologne.*" *A Tale, by* Carl Simrock. *Frankfort.*

Those of our reades who are at all acquainted with German literature, are probably not ignorant of the poetical powers of Carl Simrock, whose "Rhein-Sagen," or, Legends of the Rhine, have attained so great a circulation, and earned such loud applauses. Simrock is, perhaps, the most honest, straightforward, and altogether manly of German bards: he has not the rich oriental colouring of Freiligrath, nor the playful grace and fancy of Reickert, nor the finish of Uhland, nor the passion of Lenau and Bettz Paoli; but he is more amusing, we think, than any of these, more thoroughly healthful, more genial, and at the same time, perhaps, more strictly German. Certain affinities he has with his own great favourite, Goethe, whom he is never tired of celebrating: in fact, Simrock's happier lyrics correspond to the first fresh inspirations of the youthful Goethe's muse, much as the fresh sea-breezes may claim affinity to the young zephyrs of spring that speed the mountain brooks. Goethe is sweeter, and more graceful; Simrock has more of earnestness and cordial sincerity. Of course, in his longer works this poet has displayed far different powers; especially in his great achievement, the composition of a national epos, the "Analungen-Lied," which forms a sequel and conclusion to that "Niebelungen-Lied," which is one of the great glories of the German nation. Here he has displayed a remarkable facility of invention, and no less power both of narration and description.—The little book before us, is also drawn in part from ancient sources, namely, from a poem written by the middle-age minstrel, Montfort: there is a simplicity and freshness about the legend which has recommended it to our notice, and which induces us to record its leading incidents here, in as few words as we can conveniently employ. We learn, then, from this story, written in easy and flowing rhyme, that the Emperor Otto of Germany, son of Otto the Finkler, offered up a certain prayer to God on the occasion of his founding a bishopric and completing a cathedral, wherein he boasted of his good works, and thereby excited the Almighty's wrath, who sent his angel to bid the haughty emperor learn true

wisdom from the lips of a simple merchant, Gerard of Cologne. Otto was at Magdeburg at the time, several hundred miles away, but he at once departed for his destination, conscience-stricken; and, after a good deal of difficulty, obtained the record of his past history from the noble-hearted Gerard. This Gerard, it seems, had embarked on a voyage in his youth, in a ship laden with costly stores for the purposes of merchandize. His vessel was driven by contrary winds into the harbour of Pagan Morocco, where he was, however, received very courteously by the Governor. Here, his goodness was first tried; for he consented to yield all his treasures in exchange for certain prisoners, Christian knights and ladies, who lay in the Governor's Tower. All of these, save one lady, had come from England: she was the daughter of the King of Norway, betrothed to the English Prince. Gerard carries back the knights and dames to England, but cannot land the Norwegian Princess there, because, in the interval, the intended bridegroom has disappeared, and his foes, certain rebellious lords, rule in his stead. Accordingly, the good merchant carries the deserted princess to Cologne, where his son falls violently in love with her. She does not return his passion, but, as she is utterly desolate, it appears essential to her safety that some worthy man should become her guardian, and accordingly the bridal is on the very eve of being accomplished. In the very hour, however, of the betrothal-feast, Gerard goes forth, and happens to see a youthful beggar sitting alone at the gate, who looks superior to his fortunes. This beggar he discovers to be the missing English prince. Here a temptation arises to keep the princess for his son, especially as the latter's passion is so violent, that the father fears the consequences to the young man's reason if the marriage be broken. However, good Gerard scarcely hesitates: he resolves to risk all possible evils accruing, and proclaims the prince as England's rightful heir, restoring his bride to him. Finally, he sails across the sea, to restore him, if possible, to his throne also. For that purpose, he claims the support of the knights he had previously delivered, and his name having already become very popular in England, he is received in triumph, and is even proclaimed king of the country by both nobles and people, who had grown tired of the tyrannical rebel-regency. At last, when he can obtain a hearing, good Gerard rejects the crown for himself, and entreats it for its rightful wearer. The request is granted with joy; and then, laden with honours, he returns to his good city Cologne, to live the life of a quiet and honourable citizen, esteeming it the sorest trial of his life, to be thus compelled to trace the record of his own good works. By this simple tale, the emperor is exceedingly affected,

and makes all manner of pious resolutions, which, we trust, he has piously kept; and thus concludes the pleasing legend of "Gerard of Cologne." We have told it, although thus briefly, because, to the best of our knowledge, it is a novel specimen of mediæval good sense and kindly feeling. There will be seen to be nothing *Romish* here: rather is every approximation to the dogma of human meritoriousness indirectly, we might almost say directly, anathematized. Now that we have mentioned this subject, we think it only due to Mr. Keble, since we recently censured his "Lyra Innocentium," for certain dubious and even painful expressions, to extract this verse from his charming poem on "Pebbles on the Shore," as indicative of the soundest faith on this cardinal doctrine of our Church; that loving faith, *without merits*, saves the sinner:—

> "What is a royal crown,
> Or first-born babe cast down,
> Before His cradle, to one heavenly smile?
> *We may not buy nor earn,*
> But He toward us will turn
> Of His own love; but we must kneel in love the while."

"Good Gerard" proclaims this lesson, and therefore has a special value in our eyes. Its author, Simrock, is indeed a Roman Catholic, as far as he is any thing; for we fear, from the occasional carelessness of his tone, that his religion is rather a matter of amusement than of earnest conviction, that he has not remained uninfected by the Hegelian folly of the day; yet this tale is Catholic in the best sense, and may honestly be recommended to our readers, and this is all with which we need concern ourselves. "Fas est ab hoste doceri!"—not that we can regard good Simrock as an enemy.

XI.—"*Valerie*," *an Autobiography. By Captain* MARRYATT, *R.N., Author of* "*Peter Simple*," "*Frank Mildmay.*" In 2 vols. London: Colburn.

HERE is a tale which professes, we presume, to be the last legacy of its gallant author; though many such legacies may possibly be in store for us; for we shrewdly suspect Captain Marryatt to have had very little to do with the composition of these volumes! The matter contained in them is extremely silly and uninteresting. The style, indeed, has a certain "dash," a kind of "off-handishness," which would incline one to think the paternity authentic; and if there is constant evidence throughout of want of heart and want of principle, *this* cannot be received as conclusive evidence against the imagined authorship. We do not

wish to press too heavily on a dead man, but there can be no doubt that the general tendency of Captain Marryatt's extremely amusing works is pernicious. All of them certainly do not exhibit the heartlessness of "Percival Keene," or the recklessness of "The Naval Captain." "Peter Simple" we confess to liking exceedingly, and indeed many of this writer's tales, even those mentioned with reprobation, have no slight attractions; though we must think them calculated to injure young readers, and more especially to encourage them in a defection from the paths of truth and strict honesty. We are not here enabled to make good our assertions (which many of our readers can support from their experience) by long quotations, but are content to leave this matter in abeyance for the time. So much, however, we may say,—all, or almost all, Captain Marryatt's works are entertaining. How, then, can he have composed any thing so flat and unprofitable as the tale before us? Did he, perhaps, consent to edit this work for another — say, for a son or daughter — and was the publisher ignorant of the real authorship? This is possible; but these, of course, are only blind conjectures; and it is no doubt within the range of possibilities that this is a real failure of Captain Marryatt's own, long confined, perhaps, in a chest of old lumber, and now dragged from its fitting obscurity for the sake of a literary speculation. As an instance of the morality observed throughout, we may mention that the heroine of the book is cured of lying, which the author denounces, by means of a series of systematic lies told by her aunt, who corrects the child whenever she has done wrong by relating her misdemeanor as an actual dream which the aunt has had the night before, and which she accordingly retraces in every particular. The total absence of feeling displayed throughout is really singular. "Valerie" feels herself constantly aggrieved in the highest degree by all her kindest benefactors, never shows or expresses the slightest gratitude, and, in fact, exhibits one of the most odious individualities we have ever met or heard of, though the author evidently expects us to admire and sympathise with her. The waste of more words on this trashy book were altogether superfluous. Mr. Colburn should really be more careful in publishing the works or reputed works of clever men after their decease. Even if "Valerie" be Captain Marryatt's, it should never have seen the light!

XII.—*Use and Abuse; a Tale. By the Author of "Wayfaring Sketches among the Greeks and Turks, and on the Shores of the Danube." By a Seven Years' Resident in Greece.* London: Rivingtons.

This is a very different tale from the last, exceedingly powerful,

if not excessively pleasant. It depicts the conflict between two mighty human spirits, one working for good and one for evil, in this world of trial. The conception is perhaps superior to the execution; at least the latter, though very grand in parts, appears to us too wordy, and approximating occasionally to the mystic magniloquence of a Carlyle. The portraiture of Arabyn, the evil genius, if we may so denominate him, is boldly, even daringly, drawn: whether the bounds of the possible be not here and there exceeded in this delineation, we will not take upon ourselves to decide. The mysteries of iniquity are, no doubt, fathomless. What we least like in this book is a certain spiritual pride, which is in some passages very glaringly manifested: a tone of stern condemnation is adopted with regard to all those whom the world believes most pious and holy. Not content with reminding us that these, too, are sinners, the author would almost seem to suggest that they are invariably greater sinners than their brethren. There is something stern and loveless in these sweeping charges, which might be removed, we think, with great advantage from the tale before us. Taken for all in all, however, this is a valuable and interesting contribution to what may be called our "graver light literature," and will, no doubt, meet with very many and very earnest admirers. Its author has great powers. We are much mistaken if he should not yet achieve "far higher things,"—higher, because more truthful and less glaringly ambitious.

XIII.—*Observations on "The Doctrine of the Church of England as to the effects of Baptism in the case of Infants. By* W. Goode, *M.A., &c." By the Rev.* B. Eamonson, *M.A., Vicar of Collingham.* London: Rivingtons.

In this well-written pamphlet, Mr. Eamonson ably shows the errors of such writers as Mr. Goode, who contend that the compilers of the Ritual were Calvinists, and that all the offices should be understood in a Calvinistic sense. This point has been ably and fully discussed by Dr. Laurence, the late Archbishop of Cashel, in his Bampton Lectures.

XIV.—*A Solemn Warning against the Doctrine of Special Grace, which causes Divisions in the Church, and prepares the way for Infidelity. By the Rev.* W. B. Barter, *Rector of High Clere and Burgh Clere, &c.* London: Rivingtons.

This is a manly and vigorous protest against the doctrine of irresistible grace, and other dangerous tenets advocated in the

present day. It notices especially the speculations of the Arnold and Coleridge school.

xv.—*The Seven Lamps of Architecture. By* John Ruskin, *Author of "Modern Painters," with Illustrations, drawn and etched by the Author.* London: Smith, Elder, and Co.

This volume, in beauty of type, and splendour of illustrations, takes a high rank amongst works of the kind. Mr. Ruskin appears to be somewhat of an enthusiast in his subject, but his enthusiasm is rightly directed in inculcating the spirit of self-sacrifice, for the purpose of giving to God what we ourselves consider precious. The object of his work is to apply this principle more especially to church architecture. The rather fanciful title includes in reality a survey of the principles which should guide architects in church building and restoration; and, on the whole, we have to express admiration of what we have seen of the book. The subjects are, "Sacrifice, Truth, Power, Beauty, Life, Memory, and Obedience." Most cordially do we sympathize with the author's eloquent and feeling denunciation of the practice of pulling down old churches, for the purpose of rebuilding them. Such an action, except when a building is tumbling down and cannot possibly be held up by any means, is an act of Vandalism. A new church can never possess the associations, and the other sacred and beautiful characteristics, of an old one. As Mr. Ruskin says—

"Take proper care of your monuments, and you will not need to restore them. A few sheets of lead put upon the roof, a few dead leaves and sticks swept in time out of a water-course, will save both roof and walls from ruin. Watch an old building with anxious care; guard it as best you may, and at *any* cost, from every influence of dilapidation. Count its stones as you would jewels of a crown; set watches about it as if at the gates of a besieged city; bind it together with iron where it loosens; stay it with timber where it declines; do not care about the unsightliness of the aid; better a crutch than a lost limb;—and do this tenderly, and reverently, and continually, and many a generation will still be born and pass away beneath its shadow."—p. 181.

This is well and eloquently said. We grieve to hear of old churches being ever pulled down. We can never restore Antiquity.

xvi.—*A Popular Natural History of Quadrupeds and Birds. By* William Dowling. London: Burns.

A very well executed volume, and illustrated by neat woodcuts.

XVII.—*The Ancient Knight; or, Chapters on Chivalry. By* JOHN FULLER RUSSELL, *B.C.L., Incumbent of St. James's, Enfield.* London: Cleaver.

WE have been very much gratified, indeed, with all we have read of this little publication. The subject is a delightful one, and it is treated in the best way. Mr. Russell thoroughly enters into the spirit of his subject.

XVIII.—*Addresses on Miscellaneous Subjects. By the Rev.* J. S. M. ANDERSON, *M.A., &c.* London: Rivingtons.

THIS volume comprises an interesting series of Essays in the shape of Addresses on the following subjects:—1. The Profitable Employment of Hours gained from Business; 2. Dr. Johnson; 3. Columbus; 4. Sir Walter Ralegh; 5. England and her Colonies. These Addresses were read to the Members of a Literary Association of the Middle Classes of Society at Brighton, and seem admirably adapted for their object. We are sure that great good may be done in this way; and Mr. Anderson has shown how it can be done. This is one way of getting at hearts which might refuse more direct appeals.

XIX.—*A Companion to the Altar. By* BISHOP HOBART. *Edited by the Rev. J. Collingwood, M.A., &c.* London: Rivingtons.

THE high reputation of Bishop Hobart invests with interest whatever has proceeded from his pen. The work before us is replete with piety and devotion, and not less so with sound principles on Church matters. We wish, however, that the *phraseology* had been, in some places, less moulded on that system which looks on the Lord's Supper as "a mere symbol of a thing absent." We are sure that such was not the intention of this excellent author; but we think his expressions in some places might be improved.

Foreign and Colonial Intelligence.

The Reformed Catholic Church.—*Table of the Episcopate.*—We extract with much pleasure from the *Colonial Church Chronicle* the following list of the Reformed Catholic Episcopate throughout the world :—

EUROPE.

Fifty Sees, and Fifty-one Bishops.

Dr. J. B. Sumner..	Canterbury.
Dr. Musgrave	York.
Dr. Blomfield	London.
Dr. Maltby	Durham.
Dr. C. R. Sumner .	Winchester.
Dr. Kaye	Lincoln.
Dr. Bethell	Bangor.
Dr. Percy	Carlisle.
Dr. Murray	Rochester.
Dr. Copleston	Llandaff.
Dr. Bagot	Bath and Wells.
Dr. Monk	Gloucester.
Dr. Phillpotts	Exeter.
Dr. Longley	Ripon.
Dr. Denison	Salisbury.
——————.....	Norwich.
Dr. Davys	Peterborough.
Dr. Thirlwall	St. David's.
Dr. Pepys	Worcester.
Dr. Gilbert	Chichester.
Dr. Lonsdale	Lichfield.
Dr. Turton	Ely.
Dr. Wilberforce ..	Oxford.
Dr. T. V. Short ..	St. Asaph.
Dr. Lee	Manchester.
Dr. Hampden	Hereford.
Dr. Graham	Chester.
Dr. Eden.....	Sodor and Man.
Dr. Beresford....	Armagh.
Dr. Whately	Dublin.
Dr. Stopford	Meath.
Dr. Tottenham ..	Clogher.
Dr. Leslie	Kilmore.
Dr. R. Knox	Down.
Dr. Ponsonby	Derry.
Dr. Higgin	Limerick.
Dr. Tonson	Killaloe.
Dr. Plunket	Tuam.
Dr. O'Brien	Ossory.
Dr. Daly	Cashel.
Dr. Wilson	Cork.
Dr. Skinner.....	Aberdeen.
Dr. Torry	St. Andrew's.
Dr. Low	Moray.
Dr. Terrot	Edinburgh.
Dr. Ewing	Argyll.
Dr. Forbes	Brechin.
Dr. Trower	Glasgow.
Dr. Tomlinson ..	Gibraltar.
Dr. Southgate	at Constantinople.
Dr. Coleridge	*late* of Barbados.

ASIA.

Seven Sees, and Seven Bishops.

Dr. Wilson	Calcutta.
Dr. G. Spencer ..	Madras.
Dr. Carr	Bombay.
Dr. Chapman	Colombo.
Dr. Smith	Victoria.
Dr. Boone	at Shangai.
Dr. Gobat	at Jerusalem.

AFRICA.

Dr. Gray	Capetown.

AMERICA.

Thirty-six Sees, and Thirty-seven Bishops.

Dr. P. Chase.....	Illinois.
Dr. Brownell.....	Connecticut.
Dr. Meade.....	Virginia.
Dr. Johns, *Assist.*	
Dr. H. U. Onderdonk	New York.
Dr. Ives	North Carolina.
Dr. Hopkins.....	Vermont.
Dr. Smith	Kentucky.
Dr. McIlvaine	Ohio.
Dr. Doane.....	New Jersey.
Dr. Otey	Tennessee.
Dr. Kemper.....	Wisconsin and Iowa.
Dr. McCoskry	Michigan.
Dr. Polk	Louisiana.
Dr. De Lancey....	Western New York.
Dr. Gadsden.....	South Carolina.
Dr. Whittingham ..	Maryland.
Dr. Elliott.....	Georgia.
Dr. Lee	Delaware.
Dr. Eastburn.....	Massachussets.

Dr. Henshaw	Rhode Island.	Dr. A. Spencer	Jamaica.
Dr. Chase	New Hampshire.	Dr. Parry	Barbados.
Dr. Cobbs	Alabama.	Dr. Davis	Antigua.
Dr. Hawks	Missouri.	Dr. Austin.....	Guiana.
Dr. Freeman.....	Arkansas and Texas.		
Dr. Potter.....	Pennsylvania.	AUSTRALASIA.	
Dr. Burges	Maine.	*Six Sees, and Six Bishops.*	
Dr. Inglis	Nova Scotia.	Dr. Broughton	Sydney.
Dr. Mountain	Montreal.	Dr. A. Short.....	Adelaide.
Dr. Strachan.....	Toronto.	Dr. Perry	Melbourne.
Dr. Field	Newfoundland.	Dr. Tyrrel.....	Newcastle.
Dr. Medley	Fredericton.	Dr. Nixon	Tasmania.
Dr. Anderson	Rupert's Land.	Dr. Selwyn	New Zealand.

Total: 100 sees, and 102 bishops; one see having an assistant bishop, and one bishop being without a see. Of these there belong to

The English Church	28	sees and	28 bishops.
The Irish Church	13	,,	13 ,,
The Scottish Church	7	,,	7 ,,
The British Colonial Church....	24	,,	25 ,,
The American Church	26	,,	27 ,,
The American Missionary Church	2	,,	2 ,,

CANADA.—*Report of the Toronto Church Society.*—The last report of this Society states the annual receipts at 2838*l.* The books circulated were:—Bibles, 853; New Testaments, 1230; Prayer Books, 1659; S. P. C. K. Tracts and Books, 11,310; other Tracts, 5300. The Society has also contributed to the support of eight missionaries, one Indian interpreter, and one catechist. Annuities have been granted to three clergymen's widows and two orphan children; also, assistance from the Bishop's Students' Fund to six students. Several donations of land, some of considerable value, have been made this year for Church purposes. About twenty new Parochial Associations have been organized.

Proposed erection of a new See.—It appears that the recent journey of the Rev. E. Hawkins, the indefatigable Secretary of the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts*, is connected with the proposed division of the Diocese of Montreal:—The Rev. E. Hawkins, B.D., Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, is on a visit to Canada, for the purpose, among others, of making arrangements for the erection of another Episcopal See in that colony. The diocese of Toronto covers an extent of country twice as large as all the dioceses of England put together, containing upwards of 100,000 square miles, with a population of 700,000 souls. There are 97 missionaries in the diocese in connexion with the Propagation Society, besides many others maintained by various means. The Bishop of Montreal, who administers also the diocese of Quebec, has earnestly urged upon the Society the need of a division of his diocese, which comprises 200,000 square miles, and a population of 800,000 souls. At the census of the Lower Province taken in 1831, there were found belonging to the Church of Rome, 403,472; Church of

England, 34,620; Church of Scotland, 15,069; Methodists, 7019; Presbyterian Congregationalists, 7811; Baptists, 2461; Jews, 107; other denominations, 5577. At the last census, in 1847, the population amounted to 782,677. The clergy in Lower Canada amount, at present, to 87. It is now intended to form another diocese in Canada, and to erect a Bishop's See at Quebec as well as at Montreal. The first appointment to the new Bishopric is to be conferred on the Rev. Isaac Hellmuth, M.A., Professor of Hebrew and Rabbinical Literature at Bishop's College, Lennoxville, in the diocese of Montreal.

Ceylon.—*Proposed College at Colombo.*—The following statement in reference to the Diocese of Colombo, appears in the *John Bull:*—An application having been made for Government assistance for the establishment of a college in the diocese of Colombo, and refused on the ground that the state of the Colonial finances would not allow of any grant being made, the Bishop of Colombo has applied to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts to undertake the task, the members of the Society being the trustees in England. For trustees in Ceylon the Right Reverend Prelate names the Archdeacon, or a Colonial Chaplain appointed by the Bishop, a native Colonial Chaplain, and the treasurer of the Colombo Diocesan Committee of the Society. The college is to be dedicated to St. Thomas, the Apostle of India, the visitor being the Bishop of the diocese; the officers, a principal (at 400*l.* per annum), four honorary fellows, and a native tutor in holy orders. The objects proposed are the theological and general education of students in preparation for holy orders, and the training of native catechists and schoolmasters for the service of the Church in the diocese of Colombo. Towards the endowment of the college there have been already promised, a grant from the Christian Knowledge Society in England, of 2000*l.*; exhibitions for native students of the annual value of 10*l.*, promised in the colony; the Heber Fund, about 400*l.*, at present invested at Calcutta, and unemployed, to be transferred to the college; and from the Bishop, a site of nine acres, with buildings upon it, purchased by the Bishop for 2000*l.*; from the Bishop's income during the present Episcopate, 200*l.* per annum; two exhibitions of 10*l.* each; the Bishop's library; and from the Bishop of Calcutta, the Metropolitan, 200*l.* The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel intends to aid the foundation by a liberal donation.

China.—*Popish Council at Hong Kong.*—By order of Pius IX. a Council is to be held this year at Hong Kong, at which all the Bishops and Vicars-Apostolic of China, of Cochin-China, Tong-King, of Siam, of Tartary, of Japan, and of Corea are to be present. The object of the Council is to devise the most efficacious means for the propagation of the faith, and to mark out distinct and definite fields of operation for the French, Portuguese, and Spanish missionaries, with a view to obviate the mutual rivalry which so frequently leads to dissensions among them.

FRANCE.—*The Episcopate and the Doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.*—The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, which Pius IX., in his recent encyclic[1], has announced his intention of declaring an article of the faith, is strenuously supported by the French bishops, who have taken the opportunity, in the *mandements* issued by them for the "month of Mary," *i. e.* May, and, more recently, for the feast of the "Assumption of the Virgin," to record their full concurrence in the proposed addition to the creed of Rome. The grounds on which this extraordinary proceeding is defended are no less remarkable than the extravagant statements concerning the Virgin which the prelates put forth in the ardour of their Mariolatrous zeal. As these effusions must be reckoned among the most important documents of the age, constituting as they do the most explicit denial on the part of Rome of the fundamental verity of the Christian faith, that "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh," that is, the flesh of our humanity, the nature of Abraham, and the seed of David, fallen and corrupt, until in His most blessed person it was restored to a sinless state,—we shall place a few extracts from them on record.

The precedence in this "cloud of witnesses" belongs to the Cardinal Archbishop of *Cambrai*, who, having had a private conference with Pius IX. upon the subject, thus introduces the question:—"We gladly avail ourselves, dear brethren, of the approach of the month consecrated to the Immaculate Virgin, in order to ask you for the prayers which the Sovereign Pontiff solicits in his encyclic of the 2nd of February last. That admirable monument of the piety of our holy Father the Pope towards the peerless Mary, sent by him to all the churches in the world, we have received from his blessed hands. During our sojourn near his august person at Gaeta, we have heard from his own lips, or, more properly speaking, from his heart, the wish that a prompt reply should satisfy his legitimate impatience to define, by a doctrinal judgment, as a verity of the faith, what has always been for the faithful a verity of sentiment, viz., the privilege of the spotless conception of the Mother of God. We had already, at the time of our journey to Rome, anticipated the desires of the Holy Father, and our humble supplications for this purpose had been united with those of one hundred and fifty of our venerable colleagues, intently imploring the favour of an apostolic decree, for bestowing upon our Mother a title which can no longer be disputed. That number now exceeds two hundred, and there is every indication that the unanimity of the wishes of the episcopate will ere long be declared.

"We need not, dear brethren, remind you that, when the Church proposes to our faith a verity not hitherto defined by her, she does not thereby create a new dogma, as she is no less unjustly than inconsiderately accused of doing by our separatist brethren. She only proclaims and confirms by a solemn decree what was already, morally at least, the object of the faith of all, in every place, and at all times, according to the

[1] See English Review, vol. xi. pp. 238—241.

rule laid down by St. Augustine (*sic!*): *Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus.* Only, among our dogmas, there are some which, like the light, burst forth at once; while others, sown from the beginning in the consciences of the pastors and of the faithful, are there preserved as a sacred deposit, and afterwards bloom and expand in the open day when the moment is come for them to be produced for the greater glory of God, and the edification of His elect.

"Such is the belief in the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mother, which, after being silently nourished from the fountain of Scripture and tradition, and subsequently brought into shape by observances and symbols, will soon break forth from this slow preparation of centuries, brilliant and radiant, like a flower from its stem. The developments which the devotion to Mary has received in these latter times, the apostolic concessions by which we are authorized to give her the title 'Immaculate' in her litanies, and in the preface on the feast of her Conception, the medal struck in honour of this glorious prerogative, all led to the anticipation that a question so deeply interesting to the glory of our divine Mother, and to the piety of her children, would ere long receive its solution.

"Existing circumstances appear to concur in hastening this decision. Amidst the great perils of the Church, and the great commotions of Christendom, new honours decreed to Mary were ever the happy presage of the most signal favours and the richest blessings; for it is not in vain that the Church salutes her as the Mighty Woman who has crushed the head of the Old Serpent, and attributes to her alone the victory over all the errors which have made the world desolate."

The Bishop of *Soissons* thus labours to vindicate the consistency of the Church in this enlargement of her doctrine:—"What the Church believes to-day, she believed yesterday, she has always believed; so that, if, as is our sweet hope, the Holy See should, for the consolation of the Christian world, define dogmatically that that blessed Virgin was conceived without spot of original sin, not only it would do that which in point of principle it has a right to do, but its decree would in no sense be an innovation, and would simply declare that the general belief in the Immaculate Conception is conformable to the written or traditional Word of God, to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and the common belief of the faithful in all ages. Its decisions, when they promulgate an article of Christian doctrine, are nothing more than a solemn and authentic manifestation of a truth contained in the primitive deposit of revelation." The bishop concludes by the expression of his fervent hope that, "thanks to the guardianship and protection of the Immaculate Virgin, better days are in store for the Church and for France."

The Bishop of *Puy* considers the declaration of this doctrine to be the consolation of the Church mercifully reserved by Providence for the present evil times:—"We like to indulge in the persuasion that God, who does every thing by number, weight, and measure, has delayed to our time the manifestation of a mystery so highly calculated to edify

us, in order to bring new succour to bear upon new necessities, and that, as it has pleased Him to subject His Church to extraordinary trials, He graciously sustains her by unusual resources."

The Cardinal Archbishop of *Lyons* thus proposes the question: "As the oracle of the Universal Church and the supreme guardian of the Apostolic traditions, the Sovereign Pontiff desires to interrogate these traditions and to search the Divine Scriptures in order to decide, after a solemn inquiry, whether the Virgin, chosen of God to bring forth the Saviour of the world, and thus to co-operate in the great mystery of man's redemption, was prepared for becoming the mother of the Saint of saints, by exemption from the stain of original sin." As a matter of course, the Cardinal Archbishop answers the question in the affirmative.

The Bishop of *Périgueux* holds faith to be, like the human body, capable of development in the course of time, progressive expansion no more destroying the identity of the faith than it does that of the body. Upon the basis of this convenient theory he thus proceeds: "In the Holy Scriptures, and in tradition, those two sacred repositories of revelation, there are contained certain verities, precious treasures, brilliant luminaries, destined to enrich and to enlighten poor humanity. They have a real existence like all the other revealed truths, their origin and their foundation are the same; but, although already known, and transmitted from age to age as pious convictions, they have not been enrolled among the dogmas of our faith, the ever-wise Church not having as yet pronounced upon them. When, therefore, the Church does pronounce, she is not creating a truth; she only proclaims its existence with infallible authority; but, after she has pronounced, every intelligence bows before the sacred dogma; whoever should refuse to adopt it by an act of faith, would abjure catholicity, and be on the instant rejected from its bosom. Among those truths, there is one very dear to your hearts, brethren, the truth of the Immaculate Conception of the most Holy Virgin Mary."

In the same style, the Bishop of *Marseilles* contends that "the exemption of the blessed Virgin Mary from original sin is a pious belief, universally admitted in the Church. This belief is so respectable, that the holy Council of Trent, in its decrees respecting original sin, freely declares that it does not intend to include the holy Virgin among the creatures stained by it. Indeed it is not permitted to teach publicly that she has been subjected to this stain. Nevertheless the glorious exemption attributed to her is not an article of the faith, the Church not having as yet pronounced a definitive judgment on the subject, which will not be done until the day when it shall please the Holy Ghost solemnly to glorify this great privilege of the Mother of God, and to cause it to be irrevocably recognized with an infallible authority.

"Now, dear brethren, our holy father Pope Pius IX. has felt in his so pious heart an inspiration, as it were, from on high, which has made him desirous of rendering to Mary this solemn homage. He has interrogated all the bishops of the Catholic world; he has asked them to testify concerning the tradition of all the Churches, each for the one

which he governs, and to state at the same time their own opinion. His wish is, that their voices collected from all parts of the globe should sound forth in unison from the mouth of the Vicar of Jesus Christ, as the great voice of the universal Church, declaring, like a general council gathered around her head, a judgment which, thus definitively proclaimed from the chair of St. Peter, should become the infallible decision of the Holy Ghost, and the immutable rule of faith. When, in the person of his worthy successor, Peter shall have spoken, the Church herself will have spoken ; for in him resides the plenitude of apostolic power ; in him all the authority of the Church is summed up ; from him proceeds, according to the expression of a holy Father cited by Bossuet, the ray of government for the whole episcopate ; in him all terminates, as in the necessary centre of unity."

The Bishop of *Fréjus*, in expressing his anxiety that the precious belief in the Immaculate Conception should be placed among the undoubted verities of the faith by an irrevocable decision (*jugement irréformable*) of the Pope, thus defines the doctrine in question :— "That the blessed Virgin Mary, the mother of Jesus our Saviour, was not only free from all sin during her life, but that, by a singular privilege, due to the great and special purposes of God with her, this peerless soul did not even at the moment of her conception contract the stain of original sin transmitted by the first man to his posterity."

Similar in effect is the language of the Bishop of *St. Flour* :—"It was not meet that she, who was to crush the head of the Old Serpent, should herself be bitten by that infernal Serpent; it was not meet that she, who was to concur so directly in the destruction of the tyranny of Satan, should herself for a single instant be under the empire of that evil tyrant ; in one word, it was not meet that she who was to be the mother of the author of all good, should at the outset be herself the daughter of the author of all evil. Mary, and Mary alone, has therefore, by a purely personal privilege, been preserved from original sin ; this is what we are taught by sound reason, enlightened by faith ; what most of the Fathers of the Church more or less clearly intimate ; what almost all the Catholic theologians teach in terms ; what the holy Council of Trent itself gives us to understand, when it declares that it does not intend to include the blessed Mother of God in the decree which it publishes on our deplorable original sin ; what the singular favours tend to establish with which the Sovereign Pontiffs have enriched the churches where the feast instituted in honour of the wonderful prerogative here claimed for Mary is celebrated with special devotion ; what especially the indult tends to prove, with which his holiness Gregory XVI. of blessed memory has gratified ourselves, ten years ago, and by which, while granting us gracious indulgences, he authorised us to proclaim the conception of the purest of virgins immaculate and stainless in our public prayers."

The Bishop of *Mans* affirms, that "when the Church, charged with the office of teaching, and constituted by Jesus Christ the infallible judge of revealed doctrine, declares a proposition to be contained in

the deposit of revelation, she rescues it, by that very fact, from the empire of opinion, imposes silence on its gainsayers, and obliges all her children, without distinction of dignity, learning, or authority, to believe it as an article of the faith, under pain of anathema," and then proceeds to put and to answer "the question treated in such magnificent terms in the encyclic:"—"Has the Virgin, *par excellence*, whom we venerate with so much love, and to whom we pray with such full and sweet confidence, been immaculate in her conception, as she was perfect in her earthly life? Our hearts unanimously respond, Yes! and they repel with invincible repugnance the thought that, infected by sin, she could have been for a single instant, by her nature, a child of wrath like ourselves; that God could have regarded her as an object of aversion, hatred, and contempt. Since He was able to preserve her from that hideous contamination, did He not owe it to the glory and honour of his adorable Son to do so? did he not owe it to Himself?"

The Archbishop of *Rheims* maintains that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is "founded on Scripture and the teaching of the Fathers, Councils, and Popes, conformable to the general and constant belief of the clergy and the faithful, and to the belief of the holy Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all the Churches," acknowledges in terms of high eulogy the zeal of his clergy in "extending the worship of Mary," and in making known and defending the prerogatives which "exalt her above angels and cherubim and above all creatures," and expresses his willingness to be the interpreter at the Holy See of the wish of his clergy, participated in by himself, "that the Holy See should declare and define as a doctrine of the Catholic Church, that the conception of the blessed Virgin Mary was entirely immaculate, and absolutely exempt from all stain of original sin."

The Bishop of *Angoulême* makes bold to assert that "it has always been in the Church the pious belief of the faithful, that by a singular privilege the most holy Virgin has been preserved from the sin which our first parents have transmitted to us with their blood; that the Serpent of hell, whose head she was to crush, never touched her with so much as an impure breath; that her soul was, from the first moment of her existence, in a state of perfect innocence and sanctity; in one word, that her conception was perfectly immaculate. Isolated and transient contradictions," the Bishop adds, "which this belief may have encountered, have only served to attest, in a more striking manner, its perpetual and unanimous acceptance. Nevertheless, in order to give to this belief the character of an article of faith, and to place it beyond the reach of all further discussion, it still requires the last and solemn sanction of the Church by the mouth of the Vicar of Jesus Christ. For a long time past, numerous supplications and pious entreaties have been addressed to the Holy See, in order to obtain from its supreme authority this dogmatic definition of the Immaculate Conception of the most Holy Virgin, the Mother of God."

The same fact that the papal chair has been besieged for a length of time by the votaries of Mary, is also attested by the Bishop of *Ajaccio:*

"The belief in the Immaculate Conception of the Holy Virgin, so far from growing weaker in its passage through centuries, has, on the contrary, grown larger and stronger in the Catholic world. Hence the thousands of requests addressed in these latter times to the Holy See, not only for permission publicly to invoke Mary by the title of 'Immaculate' in her 'Conception,' by the august designation of 'Queen begotten without sin,' but for the recognition, now at last, of this glorious privilege, by a decree of the successor of Peter, and for its insertion among the articles of the faith!"

The transition from the previous state of the question to the 'happy consummation,' now confidently anticipated, is thus curiously described by the Bishop of *Saint Brieuc*:—"When we contemplated the mystery of the Immaculate Conception of the august Virgin, we felt that a something was wanting both to our mind and our heart, a certainty which admits not the slightest doubt. The moment is come when the Church believes herself called upon to set upon it, by the instrumentality of her Supreme Head, the seal of her infallible authority, and to assign to it a place in the creed. . . . The whole world is now in a state of expectation: hell gnashes with rage; Heaven rejoices; the earth is trembling with love, and hope, and happiness."

Still more rhapsodical is the style of the Archbishop of *Bordeaux*: "The comforter of the afflicted, she will heal our wounds; the star of the morning, she will light up the depth of the abyss into which perverse doctrines might precipitate us; the ark of alliance, she will reunite too thankless children to their Pontiff and Father; and soon Pius IX., re-established on the throne to which so many wishes call him back, will announce to the City and to the world that Heaven is reconciled with the earth, and that henceforward there shall be but 'one shepherd and one flock.'"

But the most extravagantly heretical and blasphemous of all the diatribes on this subject which have come under our cognizance, is the *mandement* of the Bishop of *Langres*, who, it will be remembered, had a seat as representative in the Constituent Assembly, and who is likewise a member of the present Assembly:—"When one reflects deeply upon the prodigious operations by which the mystery of the Incarnation has been accomplished in the womb of Mary, and of the truly adorable privileges of that Divine maternity which was its glorious result for the peerless Virgin, one is led quite naturally, by a certain logic of Christian appreciation, to conclude that the creature which was raised to this 'supreme dignity' must always have been pure.

"Mary, as is well known, in becoming the mother of the Saviour, as far as the soul and body are concerned, which constituted the human nature, has never been merely the mother of a man, but has always, truly and strictly, been the mother of God; seeing that the human personality has never existed in Jesus Christ, but that his body and soul were always those of the Divine Person. Now, when one reflects upon the intimate union which exists between a child and its mother, upon that fellowship of life which they have with each other so long as

the birth of the child has not separated them, and when afterwards, contemplating the adorable mystery which was consummated in the womb of Mary, one remembers that during nine months the Divine Person, whose mother that Holy Virgin was, subsisted on her breath, her blood, her life, and that for this very reason Mary was enabled, in the sublimity of her privilege, to say, like God the Father, to the Son of God, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee;' one asks one's self, if it is possible, that that breath, that blood, that life could ever have been, even for an instant, stained by sin.

"It is a doctrine of the faith against which no one protests, that the holy humanity of Jesus Christ could never contract this stain; and the reason of this absolute impeccability is the hypostatic union of the human nature with the Divine nature, in one and the same person. In truth, as God is essentially opposed to sin, it was impossible that any sin should touch, however lightly, the humanity upon which the Son of God had conferred the ineffable honour of uniting it in Himself to the Godhead. Have we, then, not a right to conclude, that there must be not the identical, but a somewhat similar impossibility in her who has been so intimately, so marvellously, so perfectly united to the Godhead by the Divine maternity?

"When from all eternity the Son of God chose for Himself that mysterious habitation, could it be His will that it should at the outset be contaminated? If the heavens must be perfectly pure for this sovereign reason, that they are the dwelling-place of God, has that God, who is so justly jealous of His glory, required less purity for that other habitation which He chose for Himself in time, not only as the heaven in which He has prepared His dwelling-place with His angels and His elect, but as a living heaven, in which, and with which, and by which, it was His will that His own Son should live?

"And does not this consideration become still more striking when Mary is placed in contrast with our first parents, and with nature in its original integrity?

"What! the first Eve, who has brought us all to ruin, should have been created in a state of innocence; and the second, who has procured salvation for us all, should have been conceived in sin! And yet it is to the latter that an archangel said, 'Blessed art thou among women,' when in fact she would have been, at her origin, cursed with the whole earth, like all the works of man!

"What! my dear brethren, have ye not observed that, when God created the world, he stopped before every one of his works, and saw that it was good, and upheld it? Have ye not read that, when God had finished them all, He contemplated them all, and saw that they were very good? *Vidit Deus cuncta quæ fecerat, et erant valdè bona.*

"And will any one dare to say on the contrary, that when God created Mary, He saw in her, at her coming forth from nothing, only a child of wrath! and that, in His eternal abhorrence of sin, He was forced to turn away His eyes from that imperfect and vitiated work, till it was purified, restored, and renewed!

"At this rate God would have made for man a perfect earth and a perfect heaven, *igitur perfecti sunt cœli et terra;* but as for Himself, and for that new earth, in which the Word was willing to take the clay of our nature, and those new heavens in which he prepared a habitation for Himself from all eternity, He would have made them at first only in the rough—what do I say?—He would have made them no better than a work smitten beforehand with the sentence of the curse.

"Ah! dear brethren, let us not permit ourselves to condemn or even to characterize such thoughts as these in the order of the things belonging to our salvation, because the Church does not yet permit us to do so, and because, in that supernatural order of things, the Church is the sole judge here below; but surely nothing in the world can prevent us from repeating, that, according to the simple appreciation of human reason, such consequences are revolting to good sense as well as grievous to faith.

"No, the Church has not expressly defined this precious truth; but surely she permits us to believe it, surely we are certain to please her by believing it. The proof of this we see in the eagerness of the faithful in all the earth, in the numerous demands addressed by the bishops to the apostolic See, and, lastly, in the paternal condescension with which the Sovereign Pontiff himself invites us to convey to him the expression of our thoughts and our wishes.

"Well, then, we say it aloud in the presence of the Catholic world, our opinion, which we deposit at the feet of the successor of the Apostles, is, that the Immaculate Conception of Mary is the most certain of all the facts not supported by the supernatural authority of the Church, the proofs of which, though drawn from all the Christian records, nevertheless, do not as yet surpass the limits of human certainty.

"We shall, therefore, say with St. Anselm, that 'to us it is an undoubted truth, that the most chaste body and the most holy soul of Mary were, from their origin, placed under the guardianship of angels, and thus absolutely preserved from all stain of sin.'

"We believe this firmly, for all the reasons which we have explained, and which in conclusion we will recapitulate.

"We believe it,—

"1. Because, if the hypostatic union has rendered sin impossible in the holy humanity of Jesus Christ, the divine maternity which sustained the Son of God with the life of his holy mother has rendered sin inadmissible in Mary.

"2. Because Mary, having been eternally predestinated as the principle of a new world, and finding a place, like the humanity of the Saviour himself, among the generations of mankind only under the merciful hypothesis of redemption, the common rule is not applicable to her; and it is for this reason that God 'put enmity between her and the devil, whose head she has crushed, and who sought vainly to ensnare her;' for this reason, that, according to the word of St. Peter Damian,

the virgin flesh of Mary has not received the stain which comes to us from Adam, although she was descended from him. *Caro Virginis, ex Adam sumpta, maculas Adæ non admisit.*

"3. Because all tradition testifies in favour of this dear belief: the records of the eastern Churches, and those of the Latin Churches, the testimonies of the holy Fathers, and the words of the sacred liturgy, the usages of the dioceses, and the customs of religious orders, are in marvellous harmony with the supreme authority of the Popes, in proclaiming that Mary is pure from her conception; so that we have on this point, though not yet defined in an obligatory manner, the antiquity, the universality, the perpetuity which are ever the principal foundation of the very doctrines of the faith.

"4. Because the holy Council of Trent, by expressly refusing to include Mary in the decree of original sin, and in renewing, as far as the Mother of God is concerned, the constitution of Pope Sixtus IV., which gave permission in the public office to declare the conception of Mary immaculate, has sufficiently indicated what is, at the bottom, the innermost thought of the Church on this mysterious fact.

"5. Because it is impossible to comprehend that the conception of the blessed Virgin should be the subject of a festival, if it were precisely the only point in which that divine Virgin was not pure, considering, above all, that it is not permitted to hold a religious solemnity on what is not holy.

"6. Because it is generally received, that it is impossible to extol the holiness of Mary too much, provided no attribute be given to her which belongs exclusively to the Creator: now it is evident that this exceptional latitude left to piety towards the Mother of God would no longer exist, if Mary had been for an instant contaminated by original sin, seeing that the consequences of that transmitted sin are incomparably more fatal than those of venial sin, of which nevertheless we should justly dread to attribute the slightest stain to the purest of virgins.

"Lastly, because it is not possible that God, who, after the creation of all his works, saw that they were all good, should, after the creation of the most excellent of all creatures, see in her at her origin nothing but a child of wrath.

"This is our view, dear brethren. It is firm, precise, and not to be shaken. Next to the doctrines of the faith, nothing is to us more certain. And now what is our wish? Our wish is that men of faith may more and more share this view; that the Holy See, which in its indulgence has already complied with our wishes so far as to permit and give to the world a special office of the Immaculate Conception, may deign, according to its supreme wisdom, to take effectual measures that this comforting office may be unanimously recited in the whole Catholic world; finally, that this belief, on which God permits that at this time all the wishes and all the hopes, as it were, of Christendom should be concentrated—this belief, which rests as yet only on proofs drawn, it is true, from the purest sources of Catholic truth, but established simply by

the conclusions of human reasoning, should be in some sort confirmed by an express definition of him who has been commanded to strengthen his brethren.

"Yes, we desire that this splendour be added to Thy glory on earth, O our most blessed Queen!

"We desire it first of all for Thee; not that our homage can in any way enrich Thee, but because, in our ardent love for all that concerns Thee, we find all our happiness in seeing Thy perfections acknowledged, Thy name admired, Thy worship perfected more and more.

"We desire it also most ardently for ourselves, because, to every new praise which ascends to Thy mighty and merciful throne, blessings ever more abundant respond, which Thy inexhaustible and maternal hands pour upon the earth; and because, according to the language of the Church, those above all are entitled to hope for Thy assistance who suitably celebrate Thy holy conception.

"Oh, yes! we desire it for ourselves, especially at this time, precisely because of the sufferings and perils of these calamitous days; for, we know it, since the Church proclaims it, Thou art the help of Christians, Thou art the Comforter of the afflicted, Thou art the refuge of sinners; and it is chiefly when the tempest grows more furious, and the night darker, that it is our interest to see Thee shining forth with greater brightness, O Thou star of the Seas!

"At Thy holy feet, therefore, O Thou peerless Sovereign of heaven and earth, we venture to deposit these desires of our inexpressible veneration and our filial piety.

"One of Thy most illustrious servants among our most admirable doctors, St. Bonaventura, used to say to Thee, 'O Mary! blessed in Thy sight is the man who can never praise Thee enough; the light of God has risen in his heart, and the Holy Ghost illumines his mind.'

"Grant, O glorious Virgin, that, despite of our unworthiness, some portion of this blessing may descend upon our weakness; for we would ever praise Thee, and ever hear Thee praised.

"Then should we have attained the height of our wishes, if, before closing a too useless existence, we could hear the great voice of the Church proclaiming throughout the universe what we delight to repeat at the bottom of our heart: 'Hail, O Thou restorer of a fallen world! never, never wast Thou tainted with any sin!' *Salve, O cadentis mundi erectrix, nulli unquam culpæ subjecta!*"

We make no apology for the extraordinary length of these extracts. The language thus held by the Romish episcopate furnishes evidence more conclusive than any that has yet been produced, of the essentially antichristian character of that apostate Church, and forms a most important link in the chain of iniquity by which her attitude in the last days is prophetically determined.

GERMANY.—*The Council at Vienna.*—The Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of the Austrian empire were assembled in council at Vienna during the months of May and June of the present year.

The council was opened by the Archbishop of Vienna on the 5th of May, and continued its sittings till the 17th of June. The number of prelates present, either in person or by deputy, was thirty-five. The following is an abstract of the contents of the lengthened synodical letter issued by the council on the day of its dissolution :—

The object of the assembling of the council, by desire of His Majesty the Emperor, whose friendly invitation anticipated the wish and determination of the bishops, is stated to have been to take counsel together as to what might be useful and profitable for the Catholic Church in that empire under the *régime* of the new constitution of the State, which may result from the late political events. After pledging themselves to put in execution in their several dioceses, according to the usual practice of the Church, their acts and decisions, so soon as they shall have received the final sanction, the bishops proceed to advert to the calamities occasioned by the late revolution, and in particular they cite the following passage from a manifesto of the republican party, then recently published; "Religion, which must "be banished from society, ought to disappear from the minds of all men. "By a necessary consequence the revolution destroys religion, by render- "ing the hope of heaven superfluous, through the liberty and happiness "of all upon earth. This is the reason why we take no part in "religious struggles, and in the attempts connected with them, such as "the formation of free congregations, &c., except so far as by the name "of religious liberty is to be understood exemption from all religious "belief. What we want is not liberty of faith, but the necessity of "unbelief." On this impious declaration the synodal letter comments at considerable length, and then proceeds to examine the various principles which have been put forward by the revolutionists. The love of 'nationality' is mentioned as the first of these false principles; after it the proposed 'separation of education from the Church' is discussed; and, lastly, the cry of 'liberty' is held up to reprobation as the most powerful of the means of seduction employed by the subverters of social order and of the ordinance of God. The synodal letter addresses itself both to rulers and subjects, and to the different classes of society, impressing upon them all the necessity of resisting the aggressions of the enemy, and living in subjection to the teaching and the rule of the Catholic Church.

The Pius Association.—This association, which was formed some time ago in different parts of Germany under the name of the "Pius Association," for the promotion of the interests of the Romish Church, has been thrown into a state of agitation and disunion by the attempt of a large portion of its members to give a political action to the Society. The opponents of this tendency appeal to a recent rescript of the Pope, in which the general design of the institution is spoken of with approbation, while participation in political movements is unequivocally condemned. On the other hand, the political party maintain that the expression '*civiles motus*' is to be understood, not of regular political action, but only of revolutionary movements.

Gibraltar.—*Religious Condition of "the Rock."*—A correspondent of the *Colonial Church Chronicle* gives a detailed description of the religious condition of the mixed community of nations at Gibraltar, a short abstract of which will be read with the greater interest, as "the Rock" gives its name to one of the Colonial bishoprics of the English Church. After adverting briefly to the Jews and Mahommedans, the latter of whom have no place of worship of any sort at Gibraltar, and the former five synagogues and several schools, the writer proceeds to enumerate the Christian communities, beginning with the Roman Catholics as the most ancient. These have two places of worship; the old parish church of St. Mary, at the north end, now converted into a cathedral, and a small chapel at the south, with schools attached to both. There is a Vicar-Apostolic, or Bishop, as he has been called since the appointment of the English Bishop, with a staff of ten priests, instead of the one priest, who was deemed sufficient for the service of the Church, when "the Rock" was first surrendered to the British. The comparatively new Protestant chapel is likewise converted into a cathedral, though little suited to sustain that character. It has not even a bell to call to prayers; there was formerly a small bell turret, but it either fell down, or was taken down, being insufficiently supported. The erection of a detached clock and bell turret has been talked of, but not yet accomplished. Presiding over the cathedral, and, at the same time, over the civil interests of the Church of England, is the civil Chaplain and Archdeacon, whose advanced age unfits him for active exertion. On Sunday afternoon, service is performed by the chaplain to the convict establishment, whose duties are of the most laborious description, and who for the performance of this is rewarded by the shadowy honour of a stall in the cathedral. On Sunday evening, the prayers of the Church of England are read in Spanish, and a Spanish sermon is delivered by a gentleman who was once a priest in the Spanish Church, and who for the performance of this service, and for assisting at morning prayers, receives a sum under 50*l.* a year. The attendance on Divine worship is very indifferent, except at Easter time; the Sunday morning congregation is under one hundred and twenty, the afternoon under fifty, the evening under twelve.

Two of the Clergy, from having other important business, are precluded from pastoral intercourse with their congregations; and amongst the civilians, who are the permanent residents, there is no hereditary love of the Church of England, of her rules and services. Hence little personal sacrifice is made in her behalf. Out of the enormous sum of 30,000*l.*, which is drawn from "the Rock," for the salaries of its officials, the Church does not come in for 400*l.* a-year, although several of the official posts of the garrison are utter sinecures, the occupants of which receive from 500*l.* to 1000*l.* a-year. In connexion with the cathedral, is a school containing about 150 children. The boys in the upper classes can mostly repeat the Church Catechism in English and Spanish. Besides the cathedral there is a garrison chapel,

exclusively for the military, the chaplain of which is independent of episcopal jurisdiction.

The Wesleyans have an establishment, ostentatiously denominated the "*Mission Protestante*," which costs the Parent Society upwards of 800*l.* a-year, and consists of a chapel and three schools, with two ministers, in the north; and, at the south, an excellent school-room, which is also used as a chapel. Many Spanish children of both sexes are here instructed in Protestant principles, without being pledged to embrace the Protestant faith. A lay-preacher and schoolmaster, well acquainted with the Spanish language, superintends this establishment; the junior minister preaches occasionally in Spanish, both here and in the town.

The Free Church of Scotland has lately sent out a talented preacher to take the place of the former Presbyterian minister, and has, by the popularity of his style of preaching, obtained a footing among the population. Hitherto the service has been conducted in a large room, but the erection of a chapel is contemplated.

India.—*Diocese of Calcutta.—Second Metropolitical Visitation.*—The bishop of Calcutta has just completed his second Metropolitical and fifth diocesan visitation. He delivered his Charge five times:—at Calcutta on Nov. 3rd, 1848; at Bombay on Dec. 12th; at Cottayam, in Cochin, on Dec. 26th; at Colombo on Jan. 4th, 1849; and at Madras on Feb. 15th. The voyage extended over 5500 miles, and occupied four months.

In his Charge the bishop observes, that there are now ten sees, with as many bishops, in the large and unwieldy diocese, or rather region of the globe, in which he stood alone when he came out in 1832, and continued so for four years; and there are now in India and Ceylon nearly 300 clergy and 179 churches; whereas, in 1814, on the arrival of Bishop Middleton, there were only about fifteen clergy altogether, and not nearly so many churches[1]."

Of his own diocese the bishop gives the following account:—

"The honourable Court have added to our Bengal establishment, in consequence of the extension of the British dominions in the Punjaub, which raises our number to fifty-nine chaplains, and, with supernumeraries, to sixty-five or sixty-seven; and our whole number of clergy, including professors, missionaries, additional clergy, and our four Lutheran brethren at Agra, who train up their converts in our episcopal discipline, amounts to 128 or 130. We have, in the diocese of Calcutta, lost four of our brethren in Bengal since the last visitation, two of whom were carried off suddenly; the other two sank under the gradual effects of over-labour. The deaths in our small number of clergy, in

[1] Including the missionary permanent churches in the different dioceses, especially in Tinnevelly, there are between four and five hundred—the temporary chapels I do not reckon.

about four years, have, alas! been eleven—a loud warning to those who survive. The progress of the Calcutta Additional Clergy Society has been most gratifying. In 1845 we had only one clergyman in the field of labour; we have now four, and hope soon to have five or six, as our funds allow of their increase. An anonymous benefactor, under the name of Cranmer, has paid his promised donation of 5000 Company's rupees, upon a clergyman being fixed above Allahabad. The Calcutta Church-building Fund has been pursuing its pious way. In 1814 there were scarcely any churches in the diocese except the two in Calcutta; now there are ninety-two, to forty-five of which aid has been rendered by the fund. Grants have been made towards the erection or improvement of twelve churches since the biennial report in 1847. To complete the circle of auxiliary plans, a fund has just been raised at Calcutta for the support of Scripture readers, which I would earnestly recommend to the bishops and clergy of other dioceses. I come now to the state of our missions. In Calcutta they are full of hope. There is no great movement at present, but a steady progress. The Mohammedan mission in Calcutta itself is now in full operation under the Propagation Society; the church of St. Saviour's is consecrated, and numerous Mussulmans attend the instructions of the reverend missionary. The crescent is fast waning in Bengal, as it is generally in every part of the world."

The following is his account of the diocese of Madras:—

"An Additional Clergy Society has been formed. The urgency here is extreme. There are upwards of sixty stations where no permanent provision has been made for a resident minister. When I was at Cochin, which is a part of this diocese, I found a flock of 380 Protestants, with about fifty communicants and 140 children in the school, which is merely visited once a month by a chaplain from a distance of about one hundred miles. In contrast with this destitution, there are ten Romish churches and twenty priests, within three miles of Cochin, labouring to seduce our people. In the diocese of Madras, I may truly say that the Missions are the honour of India and 'the glory of Christ.' The extent of them overwhelms the mind. They comprehend forty-three districts, with 693 villages and forty-six ordained ministers. The number of the baptized, and persons under instruction, is 47,099; communicants, 6806; school children, 13,087; permanent churches, 122; temporary buildings for public worship, 320. To God be the glory of this wonderful seed-plot of good."

The bishop adverts also, in terms of satisfaction, to the two other dioceses of Bombay and Colombo, and to the mission at Cottayam under the Rev. J. Bayley, who is about to retire after thirty years' missionary labour.

Diocese of Madras.—From the recent Report of the Madras Diocesan Committee of the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel*, it appears that new rules for its government have been framed, with the full consent of the Parent Society in England. The due prerogatives of the bishop are preserved in their integrity; whilst the committee is

invested with sufficient power and responsibility to call forth the energetic co-operation of its members. The committee is to be elected every year by the subscribers at a general meeting. A scale of salaries has been agreed upon for the clergymen in connexion with the Society, distinguishing between natives, Europeans born in India, and Europeans fresh from England. Travelling allowances have also been adjusted to the various conditions of the missionaries. Clergymen, so long as they are unacquainted with the native tongue, are to be considered only as assistant missionaries.

The Missionary Seminary, formerly located in Vepery, is to be revived. Eight scholarships are attached to the seminary, four for Europeans, and four for natives. The Rev. A. R. Symonds, the secretary of the committee, is to be principal. The seminary at Sawyerpooram, under the Rev. G. U. Pope, now contains about 140 youths, aged from seven to eighteen. The sister institution at Vediapooram, under the Rev. H. Bower, has about fifty. Both are reported to be in a highly satisfactory state. The mission of Combaconum has been subdivided into two missions; and the same change is about to be made in other districts. A higher rate of pay for native agents is about to be introduced, so as to bring forward a superior class of men.

From the returns for the year 1848, printed in the Appendix, it appears that there are now in the various stations in connexion with the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel*, in the diocese, 15,599 baptized converts, and 4486 yet unbaptized; and that the number of baptisms during the last six months was 519. Nearly 5000 children are brought up in the schools.

Jamaica. — *Visitation of the Diocese. Church Statistics.* — The Bishop of Jamaica has returned from the visitation of Middlesex and Cornwall, having thus completed his second general visitation of the diocese. An address from the clergy was presented to him on this occasion, to which the bishop returned an answer replete with valuable statistical facts, from which the following are extracts:—"Under the teaching of the several pastors throughout the diocese, not fewer than 10,000 persons have been presented to me in my second visitation to be confirmed; sixteen new churches and as many burial-grounds have been consecrated. Within the six years that have passed since my translation to the See of Jamaica, the clergy have been increased by nearly a fifth of their number, whilst the general population, according to the census, has sustained a small diminution. The present ecclesiastical establishment consists of four archdeacons, twenty-seven rectors, fifty island (or perpetual) curates, three colonial chaplains, and twenty-nine stipendiary curates or missionaries, all residing and ministering at their several stations in the diocese. Our schools are 110 in number, and afford instruction, commonly on the national system, and everywhere under the vigilant superintendence of the clergy, to 7500 pupils, principally the children of the poor. The want of any college

or seminary in this large and once opulent colony is universally admitted and deplored."

St. Helena.—*Primary Episcopal Visitation.*—This island has received its first visit from any Christian bishop in the spring of this year, when the Bishop of Capetown held a visitation in this remote part of his diocese. On Palm Sunday, Mr. Fry, formerly a missionary of the German Church, was admitted to the order of deacon; on the following Wednesday the bishop consecrated the church, "in memory of St. James," and four adjacent burial-grounds. On Easter Eve, 327 persons received confirmation.

On the 10th of April, a special general meeting of the Church Society was held at the bishop's request, the governor in the chair, when the bishop proposed certain amendments in the constitution of the society, which were adopted without a dissentient voice. The objects of the society, as defined by the new constitution, are, 1. provision for additional clergy; 2. the erection of more churches; 3. the dissemination of the Bible and of religious books; 4. missions to the heathen; 5. the education of natives with a view to Holy Orders. Great exertions are being made for the erection of a new church in the upper part of James' town; but there is little hope of success without extraneous aid.

United States.—*New Diocese of Indiana.*—Another new diocese has been formed in the American Church, being the diocese of Indiana. The convention met at Indianopolis on June 29th, and elected for their first bishop the Rev. G. Upfold, D.D. The new diocese presents an arduous field for truly missionary labour. In a population of 1,000,000 souls the Church numbers less than 700 communicants.

Annual Meeting of the Board of Missions.—The inefficient manner in which the missionaries of the American Church have latterly been supported, having led to difficulties and complaints in various quarters, and among others to the resignation of Bishop Southgate, and the abandonment of his interesting mission at Constantinople, the state of the missionary work was taken into serious consideration at the annual meeting of the Board of Missions, held at New York, on the 20th of June, when the following resolutions were adopted:—

"Resolved, that the grievous inconveniences to which the missionaries and missionary bishops are subjected, through delay in the transmission of funds, impose a solemn duty on the Churches to make their annual contributions at the earliest period, that thus the domestic and foreign committees may be enabled to fulfil their engagements.

"Resolved, that Advent Sunday be recommended as the appropriate time for receiving contributions for domestic missions."

On the important subject of Bishop Southgate's resignation, the prevailing opinion was, that it was a matter which could only be settled by the General Convention, and the following resolution was adopted:—

"Resolved, that it is not expedient for the Board, at this time, to act in respect to the tendered resignation of Bishop Southgate."

Bishop Doane of New Jersey.—We adverted in our last[1] to the abortive attempt made in the diocese of New Jersey to impeach the character of Bishop Doane, on the ground of the liabilities he had incurred for the institutions of his diocese. It is with great pleasure that we now give an abstract from a sketch of the history of that excellent prelate, which appears in the *Colonial Church Chronicle.* The following is the account which the bishop himself gives of the condition and progress of his diocese under his government:—

"It is now (March, 1849) more than sixteen years since the undersigned left home and friends, for service in a poor and feeble diocese. He has given himself unreservedly to the work. The Lord hath blessed it in his hands. The fourteen clergymen who were present at his election, have been more than four times multiplied. The little church of which he took the pastoral care has increased its capacity fourfold, and is yet too small. A noble structure is far advanced towards completion: the portion which is done is paid for; and the property of the parish is equal in value to three or four times the amount required to finish it. Thirty-three churches have been built, and ten repaired and improved. Ten parsonages have been added. Thirty-five deacons have been ordained, and thirty-three priests. Three thousand one hundred and seventy persons have been confirmed. These results are chiefly due, through God's blessing, to the confidence and influence which the two institutions have created; and they have but begun their work, but they are well established. They are most extensively and favourably known. Pupils from the elder of them are dispersed through the whole land, every where, as samples and commendations of the Church-work here."

Dr. Doane was rector of Trinity Church, Boston, at the time of his election to the see of New Jersey. In 1833, he accepted the rectory of Burlington, which fell vacant just as he was deliberating where to fix his residence. The income of the rectory (in addition to a parsonage-house) was raised to 700 dollars; more than half of which sum the bishop has regularly paid for the necessary assistance of others. The annual income of the see, including travelling expenses, &c., averages 241 dollars. The bishop's own official income, therefore, has not exceeded 500 dollars.

With these slender resources he hesitated not to enter upon plans from which a man of ordinary caution would have shrunk. His diocese was in a feeble state, from which he hoped to raise it by means of Christian education. The proprietor of a female seminary in Burlington wished to dispose of his establishment; he became its purchaser, and opened it, May 1, 1837, under the name of "St. Mary's Hall, for Female Education on Church Principles."

[1] English Review, vol. xi. p. 505.

A loan of 25,000 dollars, for endowment, enabled the bishop to do this. But, before he had obtained subscriptions enough to cover two-thirds of that sum, a season of commercial distress came on, and he was left alone to supply the deficiency. The same cause also affected the fund for promoting the annual cost of maintenance, several of the children receiving a free education. The establishment increased with rapidity, and the bishop was compelled to merge his whole resources and *credit* in the work. In 1845 he added a similar establishment for boys, under the name of Burlington College, with only the assistance of a subscription of 8000 dollars; with which, in addition to an enlargement of his own personal responsibility, he built and furnished an institution, in which 127 boys receive their education, under a competent staff of teachers.

At the end of last year, the bishop found himself the proprietor of two flourishing institutions, the gross annual receipts of which amount to 70,000 dollars, but encumbered with an unmanageable debt. Under these circumstances, he made an assignment of all his property of every kind; and the institutions, for which he has made such generous sacrifices, are still carried on, as heretofore, under his own personal conduct and supervision, but on the financial responsibility of others.

The Council of Baltimore.—The Synod of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, the assembling of which at Baltimore we briefly noticed in our last[1], has issued a synodal letter, addressed to the faithful of their dioceses by "the Archbishops and Bishops of the United States gathered together in the Seventh Provincial Council of Baltimore." It adverts, in the first instance, to the more complete organisation of their hierarchy, undertaken by the council at the express desire of Pius IX., which is to be made known so soon as the decrees of the council on the subject shall have received the necessary papal sanction. The letter then takes occasion to advert to the Roman revolution, and the attempt to deprive Pius IX. of his temporal sovereignty. In speaking of this, the synod records its "conviction that the temporal principality over the Roman States has, in the order of Providence, been conducive to the free and unsuspected exercise of the spiritual functions of the papacy, and to the furtherance of religious interests, by contributing to the maintenance of scientific and charitable institutions. If the Bishop of Rome were the subject of a political sovereign, or the citizen of a republic, there would be reason to fear that he might not always enjoy that freedom of action which is necessary in order to insure for his decrees and measures respect at the hands of the faithful throughout the world."

After this strong assertion of the necessity of a temporal dominion to the efficient working of the papal system, the synodal letter guards itself against the conclusions that might be deduced from it, in the event of Pius IX. losing his temporal sovereignty, by the assertion that "the pontifical office is of divine institution, and wholly independent of

[1] Vol. xi. p. 506.

all the vicissitudes to which the temporal principality may be exposed." The synodal letter then dwells with particular emphasis on the proposition, that "by means of the uninterrupted tradition of the Roman Church, handed down from the Apostles through the succession of bishops, they (the Roman Catholics) confound all those who, through pride and reliance upon their own conceits, or through any other perverse influence, dare to teach any thing else but what is certified by divine revelation, and attempt to alter the doctrine which, like an unsoiled stream from a pure fountain, flows forth upon the whole world." The synod farther adverts, in connexion with this subject, to the position of the Pope, expressing in affectionate terms its sympathy with him, and ordering a special day for a general collection towards his relief.

From this the synod passes on to the chief topic of its deliberations, the question of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, on which it holds, in remarkable inconsistency with its own assertions as to the purity and antiquity of the doctrine of the Roman Church, the following language:—

"The repeated solicitations of the bishops, addressed to the Holy See from various parts of the Church, have induced his holiness to seek the advice of all his colleagues respecting the point of doctrine, that the mother of our Saviour has been preserved by divine grace from all stain of original sin. This has been considered hitherto as a pious belief which derived its strength and its sanction from the festival of the Immaculate Conception, which for some centuries past has been celebrated in the whole Church. In the east this festival has been observed since the fifth century, under the title of the 'Conception of St. Anna,' the mother of the holy Virgin; whether it was introduced in the west before the ninth century is not known. Every where in the whole extent of the Church, and from the most ancient times, Mary has been called holy and immaculate, as is clear from the liturgical books and the writings of the Fathers. St. Ephrem of Syria, in the fourth century, proclaimed that her purity and sanctity far exceeded that of the most sublime spirits which surround the throne of God, since it is her special privilege to be the Mother of the Incarnate Word. 'She is,' he says, 'an immaculate Virgin, without stain or corruption, all chaste and free from all contamination and corruption of sin, the Spouse of God, the Mother of God, inviolate, holy, holier than the seraphim, and incomparably more glorious than all the heavenly hosts[1].' Although the attention of the Church in the primitive ages was specially fixed on the mystery of the Incarnation, although her authority was chiefly employed against the destructive heresies which attacked it directly, nevertheless the honour of the Virgin Mother was vindicated by the early Church as often as it was called in question. When Nestorius attempted to divide Christ, by attributing a distinct personality to his human nature, the great Council of Ephesus, in proscribing this novelty proclaimed Mary the Mother of God, conformably to the

[1] Oratio in sanctissimam Dei Genitricem.

constant doctrine of all antiquity. Her perpetual virginity was subsequently declared, when innovators dared to deny it. Her exemption from all actual sin was established by the holy Council of Trent, in a definition of faith; and the same venerable authority gave her the designation *Immaculate*, in a declaration annexed to the canons touching original sin. The Fathers declared that it was not their intention to include the blessed and immaculate Virgin in their decrees, but that in this respect the constitutions of Sixtus IV. were to be observed. This pontiff, in consequence of the disputes which had arisen touching the immaculate conception of Mary, had found it necessary to issue a prohibition, under heavy penalties, against stigmatising as heresy either the pious sentiment of the Immaculate Conception, or the contrary opinion. It happened with regard to this doctrine as with regard to several others, that in the course of time doubts sprang up as to the tradition and faith of the Church. The disputes which arose on this subject were tolerated by her with the same consideration and patience with which the conflict of opinion on the necessity of legal observances had been endured in the first Council of Jerusalem, until the voice of Peter put an end to the discussion. The Church abstained from a decisive judgment so long as the excitement subsisted, contenting herself with the protestation of the contending parties, that they submitted without reserve to her authority, and leaving every proof and every objection to be maturely examined and weighed in the balances of the sanctuary. But in permitting to the theologians the right of private investigation, the pontiffs took care to maintain the custom of celebrating the festival, and prohibited, under heavy penalties, any public expression of an opinion derogating from the belief for which the faithful felt a pious attachment.

"Since the Divine Scriptures teach that in Adam all men have sinned, and that we are by nature the children of wrath, the Virgin Mary, as the natural descendant of Adam, would have incurred the punishment common to all, if she had not been preserved from it by Divine grace. The angel Gabriel assured her that she had found grace before God, and saluted her as one full of grace. She was declared blessed above all women, both by the heavenly messenger, and by her cousin Elisabeth speaking by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. St. Jerome represents her as repairing by her obedience the evils brought upon the human race by the disobedience of the Mother of the human family. Her exemption from the general curse may be inferred from the fact, that she was chosen to be the Mother of our Redeemer, whose body was formed of her substance. St. Augustine, speaking of original sin, which he attributes in the strongest terms to every child of Adam, observes that he must not be understood to include the Virgin Mary, in reference to whom he could not, for the honour of our Lord, suffer any thought to be conceived which should have a tendency to sin; 'for we know,' he says, 'that grace was given her for triumphing over every kind of sin, since she has been chosen to conceive and bring forth Him who is essentially and supremely free from sin (*De Naturâ et Gratiâ*).' Taking this most just principle for our guide, we are enabled to interpret the

general assertions of the Fathers, without prejudice to the only and blessed creature whose womb, like a sanctified repository, has borne our Redeemer, and whose paps have given him suck.

" The living faith and oral tradition of the Church, must be regarded as the echo of an ancient apostolic tradition, and as the authentic expression of a revealed verity. The Holy Ghost is ever with the successors of the Apostles, to guide them into all truth, and to call to their remembrance the doctrines originally taught by Christ, which will endure for ever, even though heaven and earth should pass away. He watches over them in order that the revealed doctrines may be kept free from all admixture of error. ' We will not anticipate the solemn judgment of the supreme bishop ; but, at the same time, we exhort you, brethren, to continue to entertain a tender devotion for the Mother of our Lord, since the honour which you pay her is founded on the relation which unites her to Him, and is an act of homage to the mystery of His incarnation. The more you venerate the Mother as the purest and holiest of creatures, the deeper sense will you manifest of the divinity of the Son,—in fact, the pious servants of Mary, in ancient and modern times, have ever been distinguished by their zeal in maintaining the mysteries of the faith. From St. Ephrem of Syria to Bernard of Clairvaux, and from St. Thomas Aquinas to St. Alphonsus of Liguori, all have had a burning love to Jesus Christ, and have been noted for the purity of their lives, and their zeal for Christian perfection. On the contrary, those who attacked the veneration of the holy Virgin have readily fallen so low as to deny the divinity of her Son. Devotion towards her is an outwork of the Church, which protects the faith in the divine mysteries.

" ' We doubt not, beloved brethren, that the powerful intercession of Mary will obtain, through the merits of Jesus Christ our Lord and Redeemer, from the Father of lights and the Giver of every good gift, the necessary light and aid for the Supreme Pastor of the Church, and the graces and blessings to be desired for Christ's people.' "

The synodal letter concludes by the expression of a fervent reliance on the protection and assistance of the Virgin, amidst all the disturbances by which the world is at present agitated.

THE
ENGLISH REVIEW.

DECEMBER, 1849.

ART. I.—*Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit, and some Miscellaneous Pieces, by Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Edited from the Author's MS., by* HENRY NELSON COLERIDGE, *Esq., M.A.* London: Pickering.

THE subject of the Inspiration of Holy Scripture is one of far too great importance to the Christian faith to permit any one, who is anxious for the maintenance of that faith to sit by unmoved, while the authority of God's Holy Word is directly or indirectly impugned. We know it is very easy to talk of "Bibliolatry;" and doubtless there have been instances before now, in which unreasonable and novel theories have strained the office of Scripture, beyond that which the Divine wisdom designed it to fulfil. It was a false theory which required for every lawful rite and ceremony in the Christian Church, or almost for every lawful action of a Christian, the express words and injunctions of Holy Writ, as if general rules could never be given by God's Word, or as if He were bound to direct every action immediately Himself, and could not possibly leave any thing to the discretion of those whom He had invested with authority in His Church. And it was a mistaken theory, which sought in the Holy Scripture for the most authentic details on subjects of a scientific nature. Such exaggerations as these did not spring from an *over*-veneration for Scripture as the Word of God—for it is impossible to reverence Scripture too highly, or to bow too implicitly to its guidance—but from false conceptions of its nature and objects, altogether unauthorized by the universal belief of Christians from the beginning, or by any statements of the Scripture itself.

The doctrine of Christendom in all ages, from the time of the Apostles to the present day, has uniformly been this—that the books of the Holy Scripture were "given by inspiration of God, and are profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, instruction in righteousness." This inspiration has been always believed to extend to the Scriptures as a whole, in such a sense that every article of faith, and of morality, which they teach, is to be received as of divine authority; and every fact which they narrate is to be considered as true. Within these limits there have been, and may be, shades of difference in regard to the precise limits of the

inspiration of Scripture; but, where the general belief above mentioned exists, all that is essential is retained; and differences on minor details do not affect the deposit of faith, or endanger Christianity: and happily, until within a comparatively recent period, Christians have remained in the possession of their simple hereditary faith on this great subject, and have avoided speculations, questionings, and refinements of human philosophy, which in this, as in all other theological subjects, is apt to lead men away from the simplicity of the faith as it is in Jesus, into error, heresy, and infidelity. Whatever may be the distinctions of Rabbins, and of some modern divines, as to "inspiration of suggestion," "inspiration of direction," &c., the belief of the Christian Church at large does not depend on distinctions of this kind, or, for the most part, even recognize them. We are satisfied, as our forefathers have ever been, with the declaration of the Apostle Paul in reference to the Old Testament,—that it is "given by inspiration of God;" and with St. Peter's assurance, that "the prophecy came not in the old time by the will of man; but holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." We need no proof of the divine origin of writings of which the Eternal God manifest in the flesh has said, "All things that are written in the prophets concerning the Son of Man shall be accomplished." So it is in vain to draw a distinction between the New and the Old Testament, and to reject the latter while we receive the former; because the New Testament distinctly and throughout recognizes the inspiration of the Old Testament as its own fundamental principle, and loses all its authority if the Old Testament be rejected. But this cannot possibly be: we know, from sufficient evidence, that the books of the New Testament were written by those to whom the Spirit of Truth was promised, to lead them into all truth; and received universally in the Church, as inspired, at a period when the Spirit of God was shed abroad in all Churches, and must have enabled them to discern infallibly, such inspired writings as were made known to them, from uninspired writings.

The inspiration of Scripture, as the Word of God, is, happily, still firmly believed by the whole Christian world. We do not include in this appellation those unbelievers who, in Germany and elsewhere, have departed from the faith in this essential point, and have thrown aside and rejected the formularies and confessions of their own communions, which speak explicitly on the subject. We have, in maintaining the Catholic Christian view of inspiration, the whole of the Reformation, both Foreign and English, along with us. We have the whole Oriental or Greek Church—the Monophysites and Nestorians—the Roman

Catholic Church—the Lutherans and Calvinists—the Old Socinians in great part—all sects of Dissenters—the Presbyterians—and, in fine, the English Churches. All Christendom are on one side of the question; while on the other are the Rationalists, and Mystics, and Philosophers of Germany, and their followers here and there, in America and England, who are, all of them, in insurrection against the hereditary belief of their own Churches and Communions.

This country has, however, not been exempt from the contagion of infidel doctrines on this vital point. The practical character of the English mind has, to a great degree indeed, prevented the spread of theoretical unbelief: but there was a contest waged in this country a century ago with the assailants of Revelation, which was of the most formidable description; and, though our writers defeated the audacious and persevering attempts of Tindal, Bolingbroke, Hume, and their coadjutors; the poisonous doctrines of these enemies of Revelation found a ready acceptance in Germany, where, from many circumstances (doubtless well known to our readers), the national mind became gradually unsettled in its belief; shifted from belief in the national confession of faith; became sceptical on the subject of the inspiration of Scripture, or wholly rejected it, or devised some false theory in its place; and thence, tossed about in endless speculations and theories, has presented a melancholy exemplification of the words of the Apostle—"Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth."

The great characteristic of this class of writers and thinkers is, in general, a rejection of Scripture as the Word of God. We have here made use of language, the justice and truth of which will be at once denied by such persons. We must therefore explain our meaning. We say, that they reject the Word of God, *not in words or professedly*, but *really and in fact*. They will profess the most enthusiastic admiration for the *New Testament*, and they will boldly state that they consider the Bible to contain a divine Revelation. But, then, their *meaning* is, that the New Testament and the Old Testament contain doctrines which are undoubtedly true—which commend themselves at once to the judgment as divine—*but* doctrines, which derive their proof of being divine, *not* from the fact of their being written in Scripture, because it is held that Scripture teaches *falsehood, that its language is not inspired, that its authors commit all sorts of blunders, and that it is absurd to suppose them to have written under the guidance of the Holy Ghost in all parts of their books; that the truth does not in any degree depend on the inspiration of Scripture for its evidence;*

such evidence being given by the voice of God's Spirit in the heart or conscience.

Now then, if this be really, in general, the ground taken by such writers, we maintain that their acknowledgment of the inspiration of Scripture—their recognition of it as the Word of God,—is a mere deception practised either on others or on themselves; for the inspiration is supposed to be quite as much in the mind of the individual as of the sacred penman. That is to say, *the Scriptures are no more inspired than every individual is inspired.* The Scriptures are no certain guide: they are full of ignorance, contradictions, and absurdities. We may safely reject some of their statements as inconsistent with reason, justice, or piety; therefore they cannot be of more authority,—they cannot possess an authority different in kind from that of our own reason, which is evidently liable to error.

Thus the result of those principles which leave men at liberty to reject the authority of such portion of the Holy Scripture as they deem inconsistent with sound reason or morality, is to release man from all obligation to consider Scripture as the rule of faith or morals; because it places Scripture on the same level with his own reason; it leaves Scripture without any real authority—it wholly divests it of the character of a supernatural revelation; since it is obvious that a revelation made *equally to every one* cannot be supernatural, in the common meaning of the term.

Our attention has been again drawn to this subject by the republication of Mr. Coleridge's "Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit," with other miscellaneous pieces, in which Mr. H. Nelson Coleridge, the editor, has introduced a lengthened vindication of his father's tenets from some statements and positions advanced in this Review. We can, of course, entirely understand Mr. Coleridge's feelings on the occasion, and to a considerable extent sympathise with them. It would be superfluous for us to express our admiration for the poetical genius of Coleridge, or our cordial concurrence with much that he has written; nor are we forgetful of the honour most justly due to a name which is borne by some of the most eminent and most excellent men of the age. Yet, notwithstanding our high respect, personally, for Coleridge, we must not keep silence when we see before us the pernicious, and increasingly pernicious, results of false maxims on most material points, which his speculative and philosophical mind adopted, and which a number of his admirers have eagerly caught up and retailed.

We have been charged by the editor of this work with very

great injustice to Coleridge, in our estimate of his tenets on religious points. It is our purpose at present to show, by a comparison of the "Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit" with the writings of Blanco White, and Sterling, and with Froude's "Nemesis of Faith," that Coleridge, Blanco White, Sterling, and Froude agreed substantially in their view of the authority of Holy Scripture; and thus to evince the insecurity of Coleridge's principle, and that of his disciples, from its results.

The volume before us, comprising a republication of the "Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit," is really a curious one, as illustrative of the views of Coleridge on religious subjects; and it is still more so, from the evidence which it affords of the adoption of those views by his disciples. The notes at the end comprise a lengthened and elaborate assertion of Coleridge's theories on inspiration. The introduction, written by Joseph Henry Green, Esq., exhibits, in the plainest and most undeniable shape, the source from which those theories were derived. It is obvious, on the perusal of this Introduction, which was written "to obviate any mistake, similar to that which has been already made with regard to the author's originality, or, at all events, to exhibit without reserve the ground upon which a charge of plagiarism might possibly be founded,"—it is obvious, we say, from this Introduction, that the works of Lessing furnished a very large part of Coleridge's opinions and materials for the "Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit," and, in fact, all that is most dangerous and objectionable in that publication.

We must make a few extracts from Mr. Green's well-written Introduction, expressing at the same time our sense of the candid and manly tone in which it is written, and its total freedom from any attempt to mystify the reader, or to conceal any part of the truth. Mr. Green thus states the character and principles of Lessing:—

"In order, however, to put the reader, unacquainted with the history of German literature, in possession of the data which may enable him to form a correct judgment on the point at issue, it may be necessary to explain—and the account is not without its instructive interest—that Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, one of the most distinguished writers which Germany has produced, mainly contributed by his critical sagacity, his forcible reasoning, and by his lucid, pointed, and nervous style, to awaken a new spirit in almost every branch of literature. It was in 1774, that feeling the rigidity on the one hand, and the laxity on the other, and the utter shallowness on all sides, of the prevailing theology, he began to publish, in his '*Beiträge zur Geschichte und Litteratur aus den Schätzen der Herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Wolfenbüttel,*' the notorious essays, commonly called the 'Wolfenbüttel Fragments,' now known

to have been the work of the elder Reimarus, but which were long attributed to Lessing himself. These papers contain a bitter and factious attack on all revealed religion, though it cannot be denied that they proceed from a man who was nevertheless sincere and earnest in the search for truth. At the conclusion of these fragments, which are five in number, and in addition to remarks appended to each, Lessing expresses himself to the following effect:—'And now enough of these fragments—he, among my readers, who would rather have had me spare them altogether, is assuredly rather timid than well informed. He may be a very devout Christian, but a very enlightened one he certainly is not. He may be a sincere well-wisher to his religion, but he ought also to have more confidence in it.'

"'For in how many ways may not these objections and difficulties be met! And suppose that absolutely no answer can be given: what then? The learned theologian might indeed be at length embarrassed: but the Christian likewise? He certainly not. To the former it might be a source of perplexity to see the props, which he designed for the support of religion, thus shaken; to find the buttresses thrown down, by which, God willing, he would have secured it. But how do this man's hypotheses, and explanations, and proofs concern the Christian? For him it is already a fact, this Christianity, which he feels to be so true, in which he feels so blessed. When the paralytic patient feels the beneficial effects of the electric spark, what does he care whether Nollet or Franklin, or whether neither the one nor the other, is right?'

"'In short, the letter is not the spirit, and the Bible is not religion; consequently objections to the letter and the Bible are not objections to the spirit and religion.'

"'For the Bible manifestly contains more than essentially belongs to religion, and it is a mere hypothesis that the Bible must be equally infallible in that which is superadded. Besides, the religion was there before a Bible existed. Christianity existed before Evangelists and Apostles had written. There elapsed a long period before the first of them wrote, and a very considerable one before the whole canon was completed. Much, therefore, as may depend upon these writings, yet it is impossible that the whole truth of religion can rest upon them. If there was a period in which the Christian religion was already thus spread, in which it had already possessed itself of so many souls, and in which as yet not a letter of that which has come down to us had been perused, then it is possible also that all which Evangelists and Apostles have written might have been lost, and yet that the religion taught by them might have remained. The Christian religion is not true because the Evangelists and Apostles taught it, but they taught it because it is true. Written traditions must be interpreted by their internal truth; and all the written traditions can give religion no internal truth, if it have none.'

"'This, then, would be the general answer to a large portion of these fragments, as before said, in the worst case.'"—pp. x.—xiv.

We offer no apology for the above lengthened extract, which contains exactly the principle which Coleridge and many of his school have adopted, where they have enabled us to judge of their tenets on this point, and have not spoken in general and ambiguous terms. If Coleridge had been better acquainted with theological subjects, he would not have been carried away by such shallow sophistry as Lessing put forth in the above extract. The whole proceeding, as narrated by Mr. Green, wears the character of disingenuousness. Lessing, it appears, publishes in a periodical a series of papers containing "a bitter and factious attack on all revealed religion." He, however, evades responsibility for their publication, as far as possible, by making remarks on them, and pretending to oppose them. But his opposition is so feeble, that it is perfectly plain he must have coincided in view with the writer of those fragments; an inference, indeed, which might be with some probability gathered from the mere fact of his volunteering to publish a work of that description. By stating at the conclusion that the truth of religion is wholly independent of the Scriptures, he prepares the mind for receiving and accepting all the arguments which he had previously published in these fragments against the Scriptures. The great obstacle to the admission of such objections against Scripture would, in the case of all persons of small information, be the danger to which their faith in Christianity would be exposed, if the Bible were found unworthy of belief. Lessing removes this obstacle by teaching men to believe Christianity, quite independently of the authority of the Apostles and Prophets. This was really to suggest to them, that there was no risk whatever, in believing the Bible to be a mass of falsehood, and in holding that there was no supernatural revelation at all. Lessing, therefore, must be considered as really and effectively an infidel writer, just as much as Tom Paine, or any of the more open and candid assailants of Revelation. His attack was conducted with more address than that of several other infidels, but his object was precisely the same as theirs.

Now it is a sad and an instructive fact that Coleridge should have adopted Lessing's doctrines on all substantial points as regarded the inspiration of Scripture. We would not be understood as instituting a comparison between Lessing and Coleridge, or attributing to the latter the directly infidel objects which we must ascribe to the former; the whole tone of Coleridge's mind forbids us to adopt any such opinion. At the same time it evinces very plainly the dangers of those fascinating speculations in which he indulged, when under the guidance and influence of German philosophy and criticism. It will also furnish a wholesome warning

against theories which many of his disciples have eagerly and unsuspectingly adopted.

We shall, perhaps, be accused of bigotry, and considered to evince an absolute deficiency in the first elements of the philosophical spirit, when we express our persuasion that the earlier habits of Mr. Coleridge's mind were not of such a description as should induce us to look on him with confidence as a Christian teacher. We refer to a passage in the present volume, in which the editor says that Coleridge—

> "From the time that he rose out of *the suspense and uncertainty as to his theological system*, which caused him *to seek for a while a recess with the Unitarians*, (whom he found, however, quite as dogmatic in their narrow creed as the Church in her wider one,) when the elements of faith *were for his mind in a sort of chaos* that was yet to be shaped by reason, divinely illumined, into a spiritual world—was from this time forth a defender of historical Christianity."—p. 255.

From this statement it appears that Coleridge began as a sceptic, then took refuge with the Unitarians, whom, however, he did not find sufficiently liberal for him, (whether on the subject of the inspiration of Scripture, or no, we cannot say,) and then was guided by *Reason*—divinely illumined *Reason*—to the choice of religious views. We do not read that he was guided by God's Holy Scripture, or by the instructions of God's Church. His system was formed by *Reason*, by philosophy, which was supposed to be divinely guided. If, however, this representation of Coleridge's views, as given by the editor of the volume before us, be correct, as it doubtless is, we cannot much wonder at finding him so readily receiving the opinions of Lessing on revelation. These opinions, with certain additions of his own, he embodied in the "Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit," which is written in the form of letters to a friend. We learn, from Archdeacon Hare's Biography of Sterling, p. cxxix., that those "Confessions, though they were not printed till after Coleridge's death, had been written many years before; he kept them back with the purpose of adding the half which is still wanting to complete the argument." But it appears, from the same place, that his friends were permitted to read these Confessions, and to transcribe them; and that Sterling "adopted the views concerning inspiration expressed in them, deeming those views, as Coleridge did, to be thoroughly compatible with a deep and lively Christian faith, and with a full reception of all that is *essential* in the doctrines of our Church."

We now proceed to compare the "Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit" with Lessing's views, as above stated.

Coleridge begins his "Seven Letters" by proposing for consi-

deration two questions, of which the first is this:—"Is it necessary, or expedient, to insist on the belief of the divine origin and authority of all and every part of the canonical books as the condition, or first principle, of Christian faith?"—p. 2.

After stating (as is usual in works adverse to existing creeds), his intense love of truth, and his feeling that he should be a happier and more useful man if he could avoid penetrating to the root of subjects; but that he cannot help seeking for light, even if it made its way in through a rent in the wall of the temple; while, on the other hand, he is happy to state that he only finds the light absent in one or two side-chapels not essential to the edifice, and probably not coeval with it—having thus prepared the way, he further lays down the articles of his faith, in which he includes a number of the principal Christian tenets; and in all these points he observes, that his faith "is serene, unclouded by a doubt." "*But*," he proceeds, "there is a Book, of two parts, each part consisting of several books." He acknowledges that he has "a strong and awful prepossession in its *favour*." But "he will not leave it in the power of unbelievers to say, that the Bible is for him only what the Koran is for the deaf Turk, and the Vedas for the feeble and acquiescent Hindoo. No; he will retire up into the mountain, and hold secret converse with his Bible, above the contagious blastments of prejudice, and the fog-blight of selfish superstition."—p. 9.

Having got above these "blastments" and "fog-lights," Coleridge declares that "the Word that was from the beginning,"—"the Light of which light itself is but the Shechinah,"—is given to "*every man;*" and that, "if any difference appears between this inner light or Word, and the written letter or Scripture, he will "be thankful for what he has—*and wait.*"

So far we have these principles laid down:—that the Christian faith is something which stands by itself, distinct from the Scriptures; that there is an inward light, a kind of inspiration given to every individual; and that, if the teaching of this inward light appears to differ from Scripture, *we are not bound at once to submit to Scripture.*

He observes next, that he has perused the Bible with these feelings; and that he has "met every where more or less copious sources of truth, and power, and purifying impulses—that he has found words for his inmost thoughts, songs for his joy, other causes for his hidden griefs, and pleadings for his shame and feebleness." In short, whatever "*finds* him" [or meets his own feelings and wants] bears witness for itself, that it has proceeded from a Holy Spirit, even from the same Spirit, "which, remaining

in itself, yet regenerateth all other persons, and in all ages entering into holy souls, maketh them friends of God, and prophets (*Wisd.* vii.)"—p. 11.

Thus the authority of God's word—of the Holy Scriptures—is determined wholly and entirely by its accordance with the supposed inner light or Word in each individual. It is only if, and where, Scripture concurs with the deductions of this inner light (which, of course, cannot be distinguished practically from the reason and feelings), that it is to be recognized as divine. As he remarks afterwards, "whatever *finds* me" (that is, gives expression to my deepest feelings and thoughts, pp. 10, 11,) "brings with it an irresistible evidence of its having proceeded from the Holy Spirit."—p. 13.

Thus the evidence of divine truth existing *in* the Holy Scripture is entirely founded on its agreement with our own convictions, independently of Scripture. Truths in Scripture are believed to have proceeded from the Holy Ghost, *because* the Spirit of God has already taught them to us. So that the Scripture has no authority except so far as it meets our judgment. When it does not do this, it is without any evidence of divinity.

Accordingly, in perfect consistence with this principle, Coleridge goes on to state that there is a doctrine with regard to Scripture which "startles his belief." (p. 12.) This doctrine, in short, requires him to believe, that "not only what finds me" [that is, not only what agrees with my divinely-inspired and, to me, infallible reason], "but that *all that exists in the sacred volume*, and which I am bound to find therein, was not alone inspired by, that is, composed by man under the actuating influence of the Holy Spirit [which, on Coleridge's principles, would not invest them with any authority over others, because the eternal word and light is given to *every one* alike]; but likewise dictated by an infallible intelligence; that the writers, each and all of them, were divinely informed as well as inspired. Now here all evasion, all excuse, is cut off."—pp. 13, 14.

This doctrine Coleridge rejects and contends against. He will acknowledge that Scripture *contains* divine truth, because his inward light or reason tells him so; but he will not admit that Scripture is infallible—that is to say, he holds that it is not the Word of God in any other sense than as the persuasions of each individual's mind are the word of God. He will not admit that the individual judgment or reason is bound to submit to scriptural authority. He objects to any view of Scripture inspiration which gives it authority and control over REASON, which he supposes to be just as divinely inspired as Scripture itself.

Our object in these remarks is to ascertain and describe the

doctrine of Coleridge, not to enter into any discussion of the arguments on which he founds his views; and therefore we shall pass over much in his volume which is deserving of notice, as supplying the usual arguments against scriptural authority, grounded on the difficulties about the formation of the Canon; the alleged absence of any sufficient declaration in Scripture itself, and the petitio principii which would be involved in alleging any such proof; the impossibility of admitting any modified view of inspiration, or allowing that the language of Scripture can be, *in any degree or respect*, otherwise than infallible, if its infallibility be admitted as an inspired book. His interpretation of St. Paul's language, 2 Tim. iii. 16, is, that the Old Testament *collectively* was inspired; but that we are not to understand the Apostle to speak of *every part* of the Old Testament. (pp. 26—28.) He endeavours to put the same interpretation on our Lord's own references to the Old Testament. His objection to consider the Bible inspired (in the Christian sense of the term) is, that such a doctrine "*petrifies* at once the whole body of Holy Writ with all its harmonious and symmetrical gradations, &c. &c. (p. 33); that is to say, it presents a positive, objective creed, which imposes some restraints on the speculations of the "divinely-inspired" reason of man.

Coleridge subsequently speaks with contempt of those who attempt to write harmonies of the gospels, and to reconcile Scripture with history, &c., "and all to do away some half-score apparent discrepancies in the chronicles and memoirs of the Old and New Testament!" (p. 42.) All this care arises from a belief that the Scriptures were inspired by God; and of course it is very absurd, if inspiration is rejected. For, in this case, it is not of the least consequence, if the writers of Scripture are convicted of all kinds of errors and mistakes, and even false doctrines. As an illustration of the result of this mode of argument we have the following words dropt *en passant*, where the author shows the absurdity of quoting texts from all parts of Scripture in support of some doctrine.

"*Accommodations* of elder scriptural phrases—that favourite ornament and garnish of Jewish eloquence—incidental allusions to familiar notions, traditions, apologues—(for example, the dispute between the devil and the archangel Michael about the body of Moses, Jude 9)—fancies and anachronisms imported from the synagogue of Alexandria, by, or together with, the Septuagint version, and applied as mere *argumenta ad hominem*—(for example, the delivery of the Lord by the disposition of angels, Acts vii. 53; Gal. iii. 19; Heb. ii. 2)—these, detached from their context, and, contrary to the intention of the sacred writer, first raised into independent *theses*, and then brought together to produce or

sanction some new *credendum*, for which neither separately could have furnished a pretence!"—p. 51.

We have also the arguments urged by Romanists against the authority of Scripture reproduced (p. 53, &c.); and the authority of the Church is nominally admitted, with the object of pulling down that of the Bible. We purposely say "nominally," because the same fundamental principle of an inward Divine light, which leaves Scripture without authority, *must* equally leave the Church without authority over individual judgments. Coleridge complains that men of all denominations at meetings of the British and Foreign Bible Society assert "that the Bible was not to be regarded or reasoned about as other good books are or may be; that the Bible is different in kind, and stood by itself." (p. 59.) To this doctrine Coleridge decidedly *objects*, and argues against it, declaring that a man "may be a Christian on *his own faith*;" and that he should not be an infidel on the score of what other men include in their Christianity. (p. 61.)

Coleridge would thus deal with infidel objectors to the Bible:—

"All men of learning, even learned unbelievers, admit that the greater part of the objections, urged in the popular works of infidelity, to this or that verse or chapter of the Bible prove only the ignorance or dishonesty of the objectors. But let it be supposed for a moment *that a few remain hitherto unanswered*, nay, that to your judgment and feelings they appear unanswerable. What follows? That the Apostle and Nicene Creeds is not credible, the Ten Commandments not to be obeyed, the clauses of the Lord's Prayer not to be desired, or the Sermon on the Mount not to be practised." (p. 86.) And then he quotes some passages and books of the Old Testament, which he points out as objectionable or incredible, and asks whether we must therefore disbelieve the whole. He therefore advises the inquirer to "take up the Bible as he would any other body of ancient writings." (p. 90.) The generally received doctrine on this point, which teaches us to receive the Scriptures as the inspired word of God, he calls "Bibliolatry." (p. 92.)

We have endeavoured fairly to represent Coleridge's views on this most important question, and we feel assured that no substantial error can be pointed out in the statement which has been made.

Now the first point to remark is this: Lessing's view is really identical in all points with that of Coleridge; and Mr. Green has, in the volume before us, proved beyond all reasonable doubt that Coleridge followed Lessing, and derived his views from him, though he added some features of his own.

Lessing and Coleridge agree in maintaining, that if the arguments of infidels against certain parts of Scripture should be irresistible, the Christian's faith need be in no degree affected: he may still hold all his creed, and believe what is true is Scripture, because he *feels* its truth, or because he has an inward *light* which enables him to discriminate and appropriate truth. Objections to the Bible are, consequently, matters of no moment; nay, the Scripture is to be regarded and treated exactly like any other good old book, and criticised boldly and freely without fear of consequences, because it is mere superstition and absurdity to believe that it was written under any such inspiration as should induce us to treat it differently from any other book.

Such, then, in a few words is the principle of Lessing and of Coleridge. The former accompanied his statement by the publication of a series of "bitter and factious attacks on revealed religion;" the latter gave only a few specimens of what might be done. He did not enter much into detail in pointing out Scripture errors. But what is the necessary result of both Coleridge's and Lessing's doctrine? It is this: According to them a man may be an excellent Christian, and may hold all the doctrines of the faith; and yet he may without scruple assail the truth and morality of a great part of the Scriptures, and absolutely deny that he is bound to recognize in the Scriptures any authority to which he must bow his own reason or feelings.

When we arrive at this conclusion, it certainly does seem strange to us to find the editor of the work before us saying in his notes:—

"I have never doubted for a moment that the accusations brought against the little work which stands foremost in this volume, namely, that it denies the inspiration of Holy Scripture, and undermines the faith in the Bible as the Word of God, must *put out itself* in proportion as the book is read with ordinary intelligence; that it is even now dead for all who *have* read the book."—p. 233.

Most devoutly do we wish that it were in our power to acquit Coleridge of denying the inspiration of Scripture, and undermining the faith in the Bible as the Word of God; but *facts* are stubborn things, and no reasoning can withstand the evidence of Mr. Coleridge's own work. We cannot recommend its indiscriminate perusal, because it is calculated to sow the seeds of doubt on essential points; but those who do read it will be able to judge of the correctness of our statements, as compared with those of Mr. Nelson Coleridge.

Now, it is a serious—a very serious fact—that some amongst our writers—men of no ordinary intelligence—men of good in-

tentions apparently, in some respects—have been very strongly and decidedly under the influence of Coleridge's views on this point. Sterling acted fully and unreservedly on the principles of his master; and there are passages, in the writings of Archdeacon Hare, more particularly in his Memoir of Sterling, which lead to the inference, that he has also adopted the views of Coleridge. We cannot suppose that persons who look up to Coleridge as their master—who are always lauding him as the "sovereign of modern thought," and using similar expressions—can feel any objection to his tenets on the inspiration of Scripture. Did they share in that "popular," or rather "universal," Christian and Catholic faith, which they on all occasions ridicule and sneer at, they would look with *horror* on such tenets as those of Coleridge and Lessing; and, while they might excuse the individuals who advanced such heretical and infidel doctrines, they would be very far, indeed, from holding up such men to admiration as leaders in a religious cause. They would rather shrink from association with them in any such cause.

We now proceed to show the identity of Coleridge's principles with those of Froude, in the "Nemesis of Faith." This work, offensive as it is in tone and aggressively infidel as it is in character, presents, of course, a very strong contrast in these respects to Coleridge's writings; and yet it is written on the same principles as those of the "Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit;" and no one who has embraced the doctrines of that work can consistently find the slightest fault with Froude's "Nemesis of Faith." This will, perhaps, seem a startling assertion to some of the admirers of Coleridge; and yet it is certainly true. The fact can be very easily established by a few citations from the "Nemesis of Faith."

"What Plato says of the mythology of the Greeks, I say of that of the *Hebrews*. I do not mean that the Hebrew mythology is *as* insulting to the pure majesty of God, or *as* injurious in its direct effects to those who are brought to believe it. But I am sure that it contains things which *are* both insulting and injurious—and because, to all thinking persons, who conscientiously use the faculties which God has given them, *large portions of it* have become equally incredible with the Greek; it may, therefore, indirectly, be even more injurious, as permitting the mind to cling to it with an attachment which will render the struggle at parting more violent and more convulsive."—p. v.

This suffices as a specimen of the tenets of this author in respect of the Bible. The question is, then, what is the oracle in religious questions? The answer is given in the following description of the hero of the "Nemesis of Faith."

"His general *heart* is sound—it will not give him false answers on the early history of the Bible, or on the doctrine of a future state; but, when his own private heart begins to listen to its own private emotions, all goes wrong with him."—pp. vii, viii.

That there is in man some inherent natural power to find its way through all difficulties to truth, is thus asserted:—

"The child brings with it into the world the impulse to turn to Him; the first effort of the dawning mind is ever towards heaven, and, when this *instinct* receives its proper culture, there is no danger that, when the child grows to be a man, he will not find light and strength enough to clear him of every perplexity, and carry him safely through every trial."—p. ix.

While, however, this author asserts reason or some natural *instinct* as the sole arbiter in religious matters, he is willing to receive the *New* Testament, provided he is not obliged to consider it inspired.

"I do not dishonour the Bible. I honour it above all books. The New Testament alone, since I have been able to read it *humanly*, has to me outweighed all the literature of the world. It is because we dishonour it by making it an idol" [we are here reminded of Coleridge's expression—"Bibliolatry"] "and destroy its power by the foolish means with which we think to enhance it, that I have said what I have felt it my duty to say."—p. xv.

Thus, notwithstanding that "large portions of the Old Testament" are as incredible as the Greek mythology, and though the Bible in general is a mere human book, and may be placed on a level with the extinct mythologies, the author still considers himself to *honour* the Bible above all books, and merely to reject extravagant and superstitious notions connected with it.

The following passage, as bearing on our present subject, is deserving of remark. The author is arguing against the inspiration of the Holy Scripture; and amongst other points he urges, that the notion of inspiration entirely destroys all the interest we feel in Scripture, as the expression of the feelings of individuals.

"Oh, heavens! how our hearts bleed with the poor mourners by the waters of Babylon; how we exult with them, and share their happiness in the glorious hymns they poured out on their return, if we may believe that it was they themselves whose souls were flowing out there in passionate simplicity. But how are we flung back upon ourselves, perplexed, confused, and stupified, when we are told that all this is, as Coleridge calls it, but a kind of superhuman ventriloquism."—p. 23.

Now let us turn to the passage in Coleridge here referred to.

It occurs in the "Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit," and it will appear that *the above argument is actually borrowed from Coleridge*, whose words are as follows:—

"In the self-oblivion of these heroes of the Old Testament, their elevation above all low and individual interests; above all, in the entire and vehement devotion of their total being to their Divine Master, I find a lesson of humility, a ground of humiliation, and a shaming, yet rousing example of faith and fealty. But let me once be persuaded that all these heart-awakening utterances of human hearts—of men of like faculties and passions with myself, murmuring, rejoicing, suffering, triumphing—are but as a *Divina Commedia* of a superhuman—oh, bear with me, if I say—ventriloquism . . . . all is gone, all sympathy at least, and all example."—pp. 37, 38.

The "Nemesis of Faith" rejects the Old Testament because (amongst other reasons) it represents God as a cruel and unjust Being. Now Coleridge, and those who accept his principles, cannot possibly object to any such course. They hold religion to be wholly independent of belief in the Scriptures. They teach us, that we may allow or assert as many errors as we please in the Old or the New Testament, but still our faith need not be in the least shaken—and why? Because our reason, or instinct, or (as Coleridge calls it) the word or light operating within us, makes us competent and self-sufficient judges in all religious questions. The only peculiarity in the "Nemesis of Faith," is the fury and bitterness with which it assails Revelation, and which is probably not less than that which Lessing manifested in the work from which Coleridge derived his ideas. Coleridge does not so much directly attack Revelation, as point out *how* it may be attacked, and show that its recognition is a non-essential.

The simple fact is, that Coleridge, in his "Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit," teaches the very same principles which have enabled all the worst and most outrageous of the German Rationalists to get rid of every fact and doctrine which displeases them in the Bible. Coleridge's and Lessing's principles make short work with doctrines, miracles, history, &c. According to them, you may expunge from the Bible, as uninspired, whatever does not "find" you, or commend itself to your judgment as true or good. Any amount or degree of Rationalistic criticism may find shelter under such principles. Every miracle may be denied. The Apostles may be regarded as misinformed or prejudiced. The Son of God may be considered a mere human being; or even his existence may be denied. The principle is wide enough to include every shade of Rationalism.

We will now proceed to show the identity of Sterling's views

on the subject of inspiration with those of Coleridge. The connexion here is described by Archdeacon Hare in his "Biography of Sterling:"—

"A variety of influences, among others the fascination of Coleridge's genius, drew him away from this negative state, and wrought a temporary reconciliation with that which is best and soundest in the faith and institutions of his countrymen. Under these, and other calming and sobering influences, he took orders. How he did so, how he devoted himself to the duties thus incurred with his whole heart and soul, we have seen. Still there was always a broad divergence in his opinions from those which are held by the great body of the Church, the very same divergence of which Coleridge speaks" [*we* should rather have said—"which Coleridge exhibited"] "in his 'Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit.' Those Confessions, though they were not printed till after Coleridge's death, had been written many years before. . . . . Sterling, however, had read them in manuscript with delight and sympathy, had been permitted to transcribe them, and had *adopted the views concerning inspiration expressed in them*, deeming these views, as Coleridge did, to be thoroughly compatible with a deep and lively Christian faith, and with a full reception of all that is essential in the doctrines of our Church." —*Sterling's Life*, pp. 128, 129.

Here, by Archdeacon Hare's own avowal, Sterling derived his views on inspiration from Coleridge. What were Sterling's views? We shall make one or two extracts.

"I sent to England for a volume on *Inspiration* lately published by a learned Dissenter, a Dr. Henderson. He means well enough, but merely takes the old ground, and makes no attempt to meet the obvious objections as to discrepancies, &c. . . . . But make it ever so plain, that in upsetting this dead idol [inspiration] one was striving for Christianity, and not for critical and historical science merely, yet I am persuaded that any clergyman caught in the fact must abandon all notion of acting for the future in any ecclesiastical function. It has struck me that, if my life should be prolonged, as I must probably, at all events, relinquish all public ministrations, I might perhaps be peculiarly well situated for trying to do some good of this kind to theology. *The materials are all prepared and abundant in the books of the Germans.* I find that I could not conscientiously publish the things I wrote some time ago about the Old Testament. The earlier portions of it seem to me too uncertain to justify me in professing that thorough and religious faith in them which I do not entertain."—p. 95.

"I seem to see distinctly that the hour must come for the *disclosure* in England of a scientific theory of the Bible; which, however, will not, in my view, directly affect the faith of the multitude, but will certainly modify all our theology and theological no-education. I hold it nearly immaterial for the ultimate result, whether this revolution shall be

brought about by the writings of an infidel, or of a scientific believer." —p. 106.

"All the higher minds of Germany, beginning at least with *Lessing* [Coleridge's guide], have seen and taught . . . that human existence, and the universe which it belongs to, are alike manifestations of a higher idea, which breaks out in all true knowledge, and above all, but not exclusively, in what is called, and is, revelation."—*Sterling's Remains*, i. 262.

In describing Mr. Carlyle's principles, he says :—

"Neither is that for him the solid, abiding, inexhaustible, which is received as such by popular acquiescence. It must needs be a truth which the spirit, cleared and strengthened by manifold knowledge and experience, and, above all, by strong and stedfast endeavours, can rest in, and say: '*This I mean, not because it is told me*, were my informants all the schools of rabbins, or *a hierarchy of angels;* but because I have looked into it, tried it, found it healthful and sufficient, and thus know that it will stand the stress of life.' We may be right or wrong in our estimate of Mr. Carlyle; but we cannot be mistaken in supposing that on this kind of anvil all truly great men have been fashioned, and of metal thus honest and enduring."—i. 272.

In the system which has been sufficiently indicated by these extracts, we have an exact reproduction of Lessing's and Coleridge's views, the only difference being that Sterling agrees with Lessing in actually attacking the Scriptures as incredible, while Coleridge only maintains that it is perfectly *safe and right* to think them incredible. The pupil has only carried out practically what the master taught theoretically. Sterling was, notwithstanding his assertion to the contrary, quite ready to "blaze up" in opposition to popular prejudices. Coleridge contented himself with committing his rationalism to writing, and circulating it in manuscript and by conversation amongst his friends. It was a kind of *Disciplina Arcani*, which was disclosed to the initiated. We are not imputing any intentional deception, or any underhand proceeding to Coleridge. We entirely disclaim any such intention in making these remarks, for we have no grounds whatever on which to accuse him of any such conduct, nor even to throw any suspicion on his motives. The fact, however, is, that these rationalistic writings appear to have been in private circulation for many of the later years of Coleridge's life, and, *notwithstanding this*, such men as Messrs. Hare, Maurice, and others, continued to look up to, and refer to Coleridge on all occasions, as their leader and master. This has continued even to the present time, though the "Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit" were published so long ago as 1840.

We next come to Blanco White, the connexion of whose name with that of Coleridge in this Review has given vast offence to the partisans of the latter. In referring again to Blanco White, we must distinctly explain that we do not pretend to identify his tenets *in their detail* with Coleridge, no more than we should infer identity of view in all points between Coleridge, Lessing, Sterling, Froude, or any of the Rationalists, from their accordance in a leading principle. The fact is, that the adoption of their chief principle, the supremacy of human reason, or inward light, necessarily, and as a matter of course, leads to infinite diversity of opinion, ranging from Ultra-rationalism, through the various stages of Unitarianism, Illuminism, Sectarianism, Catholicism, and Romanism, up to the utmost verge, where it developes into Polytheism. It includes all conceivable theories, and doctrines, and denials of doctrines, and heresies, and speculations. It may with Sterling and Blanco White, assail Revelation; it may with others pay it respect; it may with Froude reject the articles of the Christian faith; it may with Newman, or Pusey, or Ward, lapse into deification of the Virgin. Its shapes are countless,—as countless as the ideas of that reason or inward light which it recognizes as supreme. But still there is this one principle at the root of all,—this principle which *exalts man above the Revelation which God has given for his salvation*,—a principle which is emphatically, the work of the Evil One. It is but one shape of the spirit of disobedience, which works in the human heart; but a more deceptive shape, a form more attractive to the pride of the human heart, more craftily devised for the ruin of one class of souls by appealing to their peculiar tendencies, more calculated to subvert all faith, and sow the seeds of universal scepticism, never existed. That well-meaning men, even good men, should have been deceived so grossly as they have been; that they should have walked forth so far from light into thick darkness—is, indeed, an awful proof of the strength of the delusion; and of the duty of those who are strong in the faith to uplift their voice in warning, and expostulation, and (if needful) in reproof of those who are wandering away from Christianity. We have a good hope and heart that England is not destined to follow the unhappy career of Germany, or to permit the bulwarks of our faith to be assailed, either directly or indirectly, without a resistance proportioned to the importance of the question at issue. And now to come to Blanco White. Compare the following passages from his life with the "Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit," and remark their perfect harmony with it.

"What then is Scripture? A written collection of traditions and

speeches concerning Revelation, collected and preserved under that Providence of God which established, propagated, and preserves Christianity? We have no higher source of information upon religious points. But is it not *inspired?* I will not give an answer to this question till I am told what the interrogator means by the *inspiration of a book:* I acknowledge that *some* of the authors of books of Scripture possessed *supernatural gifts* for certain purposes. But, that they are not totally exempted from error as writers, I know as a fact from their writings, &c."—p. 20.

"But is there any thing in the Scriptures upon which Christians are agreed? A great deal, and of the utmost importance. All good men, who acknowledge Christ as their Divine master, agree *in the Spirit* of his doctrine. They all know what temper of mind, what course of action, what views and hopes the Spirit of Christ implies and teaches. This, therefore, and nothing else, can be *essential.*"—ii. 21.

That is to say, *all* denominations of Christians believe what is essential. As regards the Old Testament, Blanco White says:—

"Why should an alternative be made, either to believe that the writers of those books *never* added an account of a miracle, as an *ornament*,—or to reject Christ and his Gospel? This is an outrageous spirit of theory."—ii. 22.

This is exactly the principle of Lessing and Coleridge—that Christian faith does not depend on any belief that Scripture was really inspired. The following passage is very remarkable indeed, in its relation to our present subject:—

"If I had a little more bodily strength, I would endeavour to open the eyes of Unitarians to the necessity of forming and *avowing* definite notions of the authority of the Bible. Like the old authority of the Church, which acted more like a superstitious feeling than a definite principle, the *oracular* character given indiscriminately to every part of the Bible places intolerance, bigotry, and superstition on vantage-ground. The Bible is revered, not as a rational, intellectual help to Christianity, but as an *idol. I remember to have heard Coleridge, the poet, say,—though probably he would not say it publicly—that one of the evils of England was her* BIBLIOLATRY. But, like all popular idols, the approach to it is dangerous to all but those who creep on their hands and knees."—ii. 136.

This, we think, establishes plainly enough the connexion between Blanco White and Coleridge. Such a passage needs no comment.

Blanco White believed, in the sense of Coleridge, in the indwelling of the Eternal Word or light in the human soul.

"I believe," he says, "in more revelation than most divines. I

believe in the internal presence of God in the sanctuary of the soul. I take—nay, I know—that presence to be active and real. *That oracle is the source of every truth,* of every virtue in man."—iii. 29.

The same doctrine occurs in every part of Blanco White's journal. Take the following specimen:—

"My study of the Gospels, which, *in spite of much that is not Christianity,* contains undoubtedly the true outline of the character of Jesus and his doctrine, has convinced me that He intended to establish the religion I have described, the purely spiritual religion of the conscience, *the logos, the light of God in man.* . . . . The religion of Jesus (to judge by one admirable sentence which cannot be spurious) has no temple; its worship consists in the cultivation of our intellectual nature. . . . . The writings of the Old and New Testaments are historical documents, which I treat exactly like other remnants of antiquity: I approve in them what I find worthy of approval, and reject what I see no reason to believe or follow. This is to follow the spirit, the guide of the Christian."—iii. 154, 155.

These few extracts from Blanco White's writings will have sufficiently established his entire adoption of the system which Coleridge put forth in the "Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit." In both these writers we find the principle of the logos, reason, or word within us, or, in other words, reason and conscience, made the arbiter of all doctrine; and in both we find the inspiration of Scripture denied, and Christianity made to depend solely on its conformity with human reason. We also find them objecting to parts of Scripture as incredible, or as labouring under such difficulties as to be probably indefensible.

We are therefore entitled to draw our inference—that the doctrines on the subject of the foundation of belief, which have been taught by Coleridge in the above-named essay, are identical with those of the most notorious amongst our modern infidels, and that they are wholly and absolutely subversive of the Christian religion. It is perhaps well that the question is so much narrowed as it is by the "Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit." The Church may fairly expect from the adherents of Coleridge an explicit statement of their views with regard to that work. If they will not condemn it, they must be held responsible, in the eyes of the world, for its principles. The doctrine of their acknowledged master and leader—of one to whom they are for ever appealing as an indisputable authority, is justly and reasonably to be attributed to themselves, unless they explicitly disclaim it. Has Archdeacon Hare, or Mr. Maurice, or any other disciple of Coleridge, expressed dissent from the views on inspiration contained in that work? Nay, has not the first-mentioned writer made use of expressions, in his

Life of Sterling, which lead to the inference that he does hold Coleridge's principles on inspiration? We should be most deeply thankful to learn that the school, of which Coleridge was the acknowledged founder, rejects, in this point, the tenets of their master; but we have not, *as yet*, seen the slightest evidence that such is the case. We must now offer a few remarks on the principles developed in the "Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit."

In the first place, we are really at a loss what to think, when we find a man like Coleridge deceiving himself and others by imagining that Christianity is quite independent of the truth and divine authority of Holy Scripture. What sort of a faith is that which is ready to admit that the Bible has no authority for us; that it is no more divine than our own thoughts are? If the Bible be uncertain; if it be self-contradictory, if it be merely a collection of the tales, legends, poems, and chronicles of the Hebrews; if it be merely a mythology, of no more authority than the Greek or the Hindoo mythologies, though possessing a greater proportion of truth amidst its fables; if we may really put aside the Bible as we put aside Ovid's "Metamorphoses," as a work of fiction—what becomes of all foundation of religion? It may be very well for such philosophers as Coleridge, and Lessing, and Blanco White to imagine that there is within them some faculty which will infallibly tell them the truth, and enable them to sift it out of Scripture, as well as out of heathenism. But the infinite majority of men require to be *taught* religion, if they are to have any religion at all. If they are to know God and to worship Him, and to know the simplest rules of moral duty, and be persuaded to act on them, they require some authority to guide them. All mankind cannot be philosophers; they will be utterly irreligious if there be not something to command their attention and their obedience. Mere reasoning, with the mass of mankind, is wholly out of the question. Coleridge avows in the "Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit" his belief in a long list of the articles of the Christian faith. Would the inward light have taught him all these articles, if he had never seen Scripture?

The question resolves itself into this: Is man a self-sufficient being? Is he independent of God? Does he owe God obedience? Does he derive any thing from God? If he be a creature; if there be any hereafter; any future rewards or punishment; or any good or ill whatever dependent on man's relation to God; then there must be a communication to man from God of his condition and duties. Coleridge admits this: so do Blanco White and Sterling. But these reasoners narrow and restrain the power of God to inform man exclusively through the medium of his own intellect and conscience. The objections they make or allow amount

to this—that it is impossible for God to make a supernatural Revelation, *i. e.* a revelation distinguishable and distinct from the actings of each man's mind. They argue that, because there are diversities of opinion amongst men on religious subjects, because there are disputes about the interpretation, genuineness, and text of Scripture, Scripture cannot be a Divine Revelation in the ordinary sense of the term. But this amounts, after all, to saying that God *cannot* cause truths, which are essential to man's welfare, to be committed to writing. For, if He be supposed capable of making a revelation in this shape and way, it follows, as a matter of course, that the moment it is committed to writing, it must be capable of being perverted—the ingenuity of man will always enable him to explain in various senses any document whatever that may be put before him. It is impossible to suppose a case in which questions may not be raised by persons of a speculative turn, on any documents, however clearly they may be expressed. There is not a book in existence on religious subjects, which may not be in some way differently interpreted; and if it be an ancient one, there will also be difficulties about the text, the genuineness, authenticity, &c. Criticism will in time find difficulties in any book or document.

And yet, notwithstanding this, have we any shadow of a reason to assert that God *may not* take this mode of communicating his will to man? On what authority, or by what process of reasoning, can we arrive at such a conclusion? It is granted that such a procedure does not infallibly conduct men to the truth—to unity in the faith! In the practical working of the system, there are many things which seem like defects and anomalies; it is not a system of optimism: there is no mechanical process by which the minds and actions of all men are brought into submission to God's will. But, if these anomalies and imperfections in the operation of the system on man, or (more correctly speaking) if these aberrations of the human will and intellect be reckoned on as an argument against the fact of God's having made a revelation (as we believe Him to have done) in Holy Scripture, or against the possibility of His making any revelation in written documents, then we say with confidence to the sophists who argue thus, that their arguments put an end to revelation altogether. They cut themselves off from the possibility of believing in any revelation at all. Our proof of this position is as follows:—

Those unbelievers who reject the written word of God, and hold it to be a mere collection of old chronicles and fables, fall back upon the reason, or instinct, or conscience of man, informed directly by God himself, as their guide in religious questions. They will not have so uncertain a guide as Holy Scripture joined

with the instructions of God's ministers, and the traditions of the Catholic Church of all ages as a check on the license of private speculation. No: this is not sufficient for them. They must have an infallible and divine monitor within them. Now, then, let us ask of these sophists, Is THEIR MONITOR INFALLIBLE? If they reject Scripture, and the creeds of the universal Church, because they have not created unquestioning agreement in all points amongst men, what can they say for their own boasted reason, instinct, divine light, or Logos? Has that reason or light led *them* to unity? Has it cast Strauss, Lessing, Tom Paine, Coleridge, Hare, Neander, Arnold, Maurice, Froude, Newman, and Ward, exactly in the same mould of doctrine? Are there no differences to be found amongst those who recognize the inward light? Quakers, Unitarians, Rationalists, Mystics, Deists, enthusiasts of all kinds, recognize equally the inner divine light; and yet, is there a single point on which they are agreed? The result, then, is, that these advocates of the boasted supremacy of the human intellect, as divinely informed, are driven to the conclusion that there can be no revelation—that God has no means of making known His will to man; for the same arguments which they employ against the Scripture Revelation are equally valid against the revelation which they suppose to be made to every individual. And there is but one step from this to atheism. For how can they believe that there is any God, if they do not allow Him the power even of distinctly telling man his duty? What a notion of God is this! What a helpless Deity they must picture to themselves! The deities of Greece and Rome, soiled as they were with impurities, would yet be far preferable to such a useless Being as this. Of one point we may be sure, that any one who conceives the notion of a Deity without the power of teaching, ruling, and exercising Almighty *power* over man, is a mere fiction of imagination; and that any one who professes to acknowledge such a God is not a worshipper of the TRUE GOD, but of an idol conceived in the vanity of his own heart.

The faith of the Christian stands on a foundation far elevated above the contests and uncertainties of philosophy falsely so called. It is rooted in depths where the sophist is unable to penetrate, and ascends in its majestic simplicity into regions of high thought and holy meditation, where the Scribe and the Sadducee, the Reasoner and the Speculator of this world, are left at an immeasurable distance beneath. Believing in that which the world around us tells him—in that which the voice of consentient humanity attests to him—the existence of an Almighty Creator and Ruler, on whose awful decree the happiness or misery

of man is dependent,—believing also in the power of God to reveal this will to man, for his salvation—the Christian knows, not only from the testimony of all around him, but from the voice of conscience guided by the Holy Ghost, that God has indeed revealed Himself to us, and that the Scriptures contain this Revelation, and are His Word. He is rational in this belief, because he acts on the same motives on which his belief in all past events and facts depends. He knows that, if he were to doubt the grounds on which Scripture, *i.e.* on which the facts and doctrines of Christianity depend, he might just as reasonably doubt every event in history, or even question the evidence of his senses. He knows that high probability, amounting to moral certainty, and founded on experience, and moral reasonings, is all that we can attain to in this life. There is nothing which may not be disputed and questioned. Therefore, without entering on the vain and useless speculations which Philosophy would place in his way, he remains "rooted and grounded in the faith," being persuaded in his heart of hearts that "holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost"—that "holy Scripture is given by inspiration of God"—that "if they hear not Moses and the Prophets," the Apostles and Evangelists, "neither would they be persuaded though one rose from the dead" before them! And it is this holy simplicity of faith, which the "wicked dreamers" of philosophy "falsely so called" cannot realize themselves, and seek to destroy in others. May their unholy work come to nought! and may some of them be led, before it be too late for themselves, to return from the soul-ensnaring speculations of infidelity, to the sobriety, humility, and consistency of that faith which the unlettered Apostles planted, and which will survive all speculations and all philosophies.

Art. II.—1. *Hebrew Characters derived from Hieroglyphics. The original Pictures applied to the Interpretation of various Words and Passages in the Sacred Writings, &c. By* John Lamb, D.D., *Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.* London: J. W. Parker.

2. *A Vindication of Protestant Principles. By* Phileleutherus Anglicanus. London: J. W. Parker.

3. *Biblisches Realwörterbuch zum Handgebrauch für Studirende, Candidaten, Gymnasiallehrer und Prediger, ausgearbeitet von* Dr. Georg Benedict Winer. *Dritte sehr verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage.* Leipzig: bei Carl Heinrich Reclam, sen.

It has become quite the fashion among our modern illuminati to represent the religion both of the Old and New Testament as largely impregnated with heathen elements. The period during which this adulteration was mainly effected is said to have been the Babylonish captivity, when the Hebrews were brought into close communication with the Medo-Persian magi. No longer crippled by ritual observances, and charmed (it would appear) by the sublimer teaching of their conquerors, they speedily lost that exclusive sternness which had characterized their forefathers: the "hostile odium," which Tacitus remarked in their estimate of all foreign systems, and which a far greater than Tacitus recorded of them as they "sat down and wept by the waters of Babylon," was for a while most mysteriously suspended; and, with all the alacrity of emancipated youth, they proceeded to enrich the doctrine of Moses from the treasures of Gentile philosophy. Nor, in the opinion of the authors to whom we are alluding, was this facile and free-thinking spirit confined to one school or faction: it soon conciliated a very general welcome, among priests and prophets as well as the ignoble vulgar; and, if we except a small remnant which was hereafter to expand into the sect of the Sadducees, the Hebrew nation returned from their brief exile thoroughly converted to the Zend-Avesta.

As a first consequence of this change, the dualistic principles of the magi were henceforward current in Judæa. To the one supreme Lord, the Author of all good, was conjoined Ahriman, the source of all evil,—modified, it may be, by the peculiar temperament of the Jews, and distinguished by a Semitic, instead of

a Zendic title, but still *essentially* the same being as in the creed of Zerdusht, and subsequently in that of the Manichees. In support of this hypothesis, we are assured that, before the Babylonish exile, the Hebrews had no demonology whatsoever; that Satan, the chief of reprobate angels, was, in a dogmatic sense, altogether unknown,—there being in fact no room either for his existence or his agency, so long as moral evil was regarded as man's own act, so long as the penalty was believed to be entailed by his own unsolicited transgression. God was (they tell us) the proper source (ausgangspunct) of all unhappiness, and every calamity inflicted upon men was a necessary and immediate exertion of His righteous vengeance (*Winer*, ii. 384).

From the same eventful epoch, we are instructed to date the "angelology" of the Hebrews, including under that term their dogmatic teaching on the subject, both of good and fallen angels. Presentiments, it is confessed, there had long been of intelligences ranking above man; as, for example, the genii of popular tradition, which owed their origin (we are told) to an imperfect apprehension of the omnipresence of the Deity, and served as so many *points d'appui* for grasping theological abstractions: yet never till the Hebrews were initiated into the learning of the Parsee magi, had their conceptions of superhuman beings gained any degree of maturity, or any systematic conformation. Then it was that the Amshaspands of Ormuzd, together with the subordinate Izeds and Feruers, re-appeared in the angelic orders of the Rabbins, and, through them, in the pages of the New Testament: while their demonology found its type in the corresponding arrangement of the antagonistic kingdom of darkness.

In other words, if we are to believe the writers whose views we have just been stating, a *revolution* took place in the religious system of the Hebrews, at the period of the Babylonic exile; and Sadduceeism, which confessed "neither angel nor spirit," was, in the age of our blessed Lord, the legitimate representative of the patriarchal creed.

Now the historical incongruities of this theory are so many and so inexplicable, that we might have reasonably left it to silent reprobation; and had its influence been wholly restricted to the other side of the German Ocean, such most likely would have been our decision. But, alas! there is too much evidence that the plague is fast spreading even here, that the locusts of a profane philosophy are threatening to consume our own goodly heritage; and to remain silent in such a case is to abandon our proper calling, nay, it is to provoke the still deadlier plague of a judicial "darkness," by which of old time the locusts were succeeded.

In order to justify these our apprehensions, it is not necessary to go beyond the first two volumes, which we have placed at the head of this article; and in selecting them we are by no means producing the worst samples at our command. They are not translations from avowed misbelievers of the school of Hegel, or Paulus, or Strauss; neither do they emanate from persons who have relinquished the communion of the Church, and set at naught her maternal guidance. The author of the first has been for twelve years Dean of Bristol, and for twenty-seven years the head of that college which educated Archbishop Parker. The second work (though anonymous) is attributed without hesitation to the principal of an important grammar-school, who was recently an unsuccessful candidate for still higher preferment. Thus both writers are scholars and clergymen, and, if we may trust their professions, κατ' ἐξοχήν *Protestant*. They are alike gifted by nature and position with no common opportunities for good, and, as the guardians of a distinctive creed, the creed, namely, of the Church of England, they are bound by the most solemn obligations to "teach no other doctrine," and to "contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."

On these accounts, the task which has been assigned us is as painful to our feelings as imperative on our judgment. We believe most firmly that the healthfulness of the Church is in direct proportion to the orthodoxy of her clergy; that a hearty and manly assertion of her principles is the surest way to preserve her integrity, and to strengthen the sinews of her usefulness; while they who either hold those principles with timid hesitation, or under the plea of purging out her dross would debase her precious metals, are sitting in the chair not of Peter, but of Judas,—are "the death of the nurse that feedeth them."

How far this censure is applicable to the above-mentioned writers will be judged as we proceed to examine their productions. In both, after the most cursory perusal, one cannot fail to observe the same πρῶτον ψεῦδος, the same root of bitterness, a restless spirit of speculation, an impatience of all authority save that of the individual fancy, an irreverent handling of Holy Scripture, and a contempt for the received interpretations: although in the degree of its doctrinal divergency, as well as in the tone and temper which pervade it, the latter work has an especial claim to indignant castigation.

I. With Dr. Lamb's theory about Hebrew Hieroglyphics we have at present no immediate concern. Fanciful in many portions, in others not destitute of something like ingenuity, the book might have lived through its day without demanding any

notice at our hands, if the author had not ventured upon themes which betray a most melancholy obliquity in his view of religious truth.

"Non omnes arbusta juvant humilesque myricæ,"

was the reflection of the Roman poet; but, for our part, we had rather see our divines growing grey at palæozoology or palæophytology, than in reviving the heresies of past ages, or in elaborating new ones.

We pass over some startling observations (pp. 93 sqq.) on the history of man in his Paradisiacal condition, to Dr. Lamb's notions of the fall, and the nature of Satanic influence. His object does not lead him to any direct statement respecting the existence of *good* angels, although he is undoubtedly aware that very many of his remarks are quite as applicable to them as to the "Devil and his angels." If "the Ahriman of Zoroaster is the original model of Satan, and the Jews introduced this, with various other notions, into their writings" (p. 118), it is not improbable that Dr. Lamb would by this time extend his analogies somewhat further, and even assent to the developments of his friend "Phileleutherus Anglicanus." We will not, however, press this consideration, but confine ourselves to what is most distinctly avowed in the following extract from his work:—

"In the above account of man's fall, it will be observed that there is no mention made of the interference of any evil spirit. And in the whole course of the sacred history *there is not one text* from which we can rightly infer that *there is an order of beings such as are generally represented by the fallen angels, or that sin existed before Eve's transgression.* Divines find a difficulty in reconciling the sin and rebellion of man with that state of innocence in which he was created. . . . . If it be a thing incredible that man, left to his own powers, should sin, how much more incredible is it that an order of angels, who enjoyed much nearer communion with God, and far excelled man in every intellectual faculty, should be the authors of sin? But I will proceed to examine the evidence which the word of God affords us upon this subject."—pp. 112, 113.

Dr. Lamb here interposes a caveat, of which we shall willingly give him the advantage:—

"I may here be allowed to guard the reader against any mistake respecting the object I am pursuing: I am not attempting to prove that Satanic influence has not existed, or does not exist, but that the authors of it are *not fallen angels,* and had no existence before Eve's transgression."—p. 113.

We were curious to ascertain what the Dean of Bristol *does*

think respecting the Tempter, his origin, and his agency; but in this we are cruelly disappointed, for he at once proceeds to those texts of Scripture which divines have hitherto brought forward in proof of the "received opinions." The passages are two in number, 2 Pet. ii. 4—6 ("For if God spared not the angels that sinned," &c.), and Jude 5—7 ("And the angels which kept not their first estate," &c.). Of both Dr. Lamb absolutely determines, that "no argument can be drawn from these passages, unsupported by collateral evidence, in favour of the generally received opinions" (p. 115). It would, we fear, be a bootless task to collect the almost unanimous verdict of commentators in all ages as to the import of the texts above cited; for, by persons like Dr. Lamb, the rule of St. Vincentius is exploded as "not only retrogressive in its tendency, but as contributing more than any other rule towards narrowing the confines of Catholic truth" (*Vindication of Protestant Principles*, p. 34). In spite, however, of this distaste for the διδαχὴ πατροπαράδοτος, we cannot help informing the Dean of Bristol, that, in denying the application of the above texts to the fallen angels, he was anticipated nearly two centuries by the notorious Balthasar Bekker, whom Bayle characterized as a "rank rationalist." Yet even Bekker, we must add in fairness, was not prepared to question the personality of demons; indeed he argued for it from other passages of Scripture, but maintained that the prince of darkness was now chained down in hell, and therefore was unable to intermeddle in the fortunes of the Christian Church. This mention of the Low-Dutch misbeliever reminds us of another form, under which the same restless and speculative temper found its first expression in our country. Among the opinions of "Certain Libertines" (the Family of Love), confuted by W. Wilkinson, fol. 66, ed. 1579, we have one couched in the following language: "There is no deuill, but suche as the painters make." With the exception of these, and a few obscure essays of the Deists and quasi-Deists of the last century [1], the Socinians and Neologians share the whole merit of this opinion respecting Satan with a section of our own angelologists.

But forgetting the grave consideration, which these facts cannot fail to open, what, let us ask, are Dr. Lamb's *arguments* in support of his novel interpretation? He begins by telling us that the word ἄγγελος corresponds to the Hebrew מַלְאָךְ, signifying "a messenger." This we have no difficulty in admitting, although in the course of our biblical studies we have never before seen it

[1] e. g. Wm. Ashdowne, in 1791, published a pamphlet to show that "the opinion concerning the devil as a fallen angel has no foundation in Scripture."

affirmed, that the Hebrew word for "angel" is *identical* with מֶלֶךְ "a king" (p. 114). But granting this also for the sake of argument, how does it assist in establishing Dr. Lamb's assertion, that the "angels" of St. Peter and St. Jude are members of "the great antediluvian apostasy?" (p. 115.) In what peculiar sense were *they* "messengers," or "chiefs," or "kings?" It is true they may be said literally to have "sinned," and metaphorically to have "left their own habitation," and to have been "cast down to hell;" but with no less truth might this be affirmed of the impious *in all ages*. We are not, therefore, unreasonable in demanding a far more *specific* exposition of the texts which are cited by the Dean of Bristol. And such an exposition is, we think, afforded to us by the clear language of St. Peter, who distinguishes the apostate "angels" in verse 4, from "the old world" in verse 5, and from the postdiluvian catastrophe in verse 6; so that, if we were reading this passage for the first time, unhampered by all theories of our own, we could scarcely miss the conclusion which the Church in all ages has been teaching. This much will suffice for Dr. Lamb's "rational" exegesis.

We have more to observe upon the meaning of ἄγγελος in its reference to superhuman intelligences, as well as upon the copious notices of the *Old* Testament, touching this subject of angelology: but we prefer to reserve our remarks till we encounter the more sweeping objections of the vindicator of "Protestant Principles."

No sooner has Dr. Lamb escaped from the above passages by the "licentious and deluding art" of explaining them away, than he repeats with a somewhat daring emphasis:—

> "There is a perfect silence in Scripture respecting any fallen angels or the existence of sin prior to Adam's transgression."—p. 116.

Yet in spite of this strong assertion, he seems unable to shake off the misgiving that other texts are in fact producible, which might tell against his statement. Accordingly, after some loose remarks on the silence of ejected demons as to their own heavenly origin, he proceeds to the denunciation of our Lord as recorded in St. Matthew's Gospel: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for *the devil and his angels*" (xxv. 41). Now we venture to affirm that all simple-minded Christians would pronounce this text fatal to Dr. Lamb, and decisive of our own view of the question, viz., that the agents of Satanic malice here spoken of are no other than "the angels who kept not their first estate," and with whom all "children of the devil" will be doomed at the day of judgment; but in the hands of a philosopher like the Dean of Bristol, this testimony is at once most dexterously alchemised so as to become altogether *irrelevant*:—

"Can any thing," he asks, "be clearer than that in this passage by 'the devil and his angels' is meant the *whole body of wicked souls from the creation to the day of judgment?* This place is prepared for them as the kingdom of heaven for the saints. It is the same as if our Saviour said, 'prepared for *you*, the devil and his angels.'"—p. 117.

We know of few flights even in the history of German hermeneutics which can fairly be placed in competition with the hardihood of this criticism; yet we feel at the same time how fruitless would be the most elaborate refutation of it when its author can resort to such expedients for the justification of his error [2].

Let us, however, entreat Dr. Lamb to reflect upon the following texts which (it would seem) have escaped his notice. St. Paul, after asking the Corinthians, "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the *world?*" proceeds a step further, and inquires in the next verse, "Know ye not that we shall judge *angels?* How much more things that pertain to this life?" (1 Cor. vi. 2, 3.) Will Dr. Lamb maintain that these questions are identical? We think he would hardly venture upon such a paradox: if not, then angels are not only distinct from men, but will hereafter appear as culprits when "the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints to execute judgment upon all." Yet the *holy* angels, having kept their first estate, and being now beyond the possibility of falling, can in no wise be regarded as the subjects of human censure: the Apostle, therefore, can have meant none other than the *apostate* angels, those whom God "charged with folly" (Job iv. 18); those whom He sent among the Egyptians (Ps. lxxviii. 49); those whom, as Christians, we are encouraged not to fear (Rom. viii. 38); those, lastly, of whom we read at large in a notable passage of the Apocalypse, appointed for the festival of St. Michael: "And there was war in heaven: Michael and *his angels* fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and *his angels*, and prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and *his angels* were cast out with him." (Rev. xii. 7—9.) Whatever be the precise import of this passage, whether the scene be laid in the future or in the past, it describes a tremendous conflict between spiritual beings arrayed both on this side and on that, in distinct ranks

[2] There are some happy remarks on this passage in Bp. Jebb's "Sacred Literature," pp. 364, 365, ed. 1831. Hobbes in the "Leviathan," p. 213, ed. 1651, throws out a conjecture which, oddly enough, tallies with that of Dr. Lamb: "Unless we might think the name of 'devil and his angels' may be understood of the Church's adversaries and their ministers."

and orders: and if (as we are bound to hope) Dr. Lamb does not deny the personality of *good* angels, or the pre-eminence of St. Michael, how will he escape from the conclusion that Satan and his army are no less real, no less præterhuman, no less *angelic?*

II. We will now pass from Dr. Lamb's angelology to that of his successor "Phileleutherus Anglicanus;" and the first thought which strikes us is the unblushing boldness of the latter in his treatment of theological topics. Verily, he is a doughty champion, albeit, as he tells us in the Preface (p. xi.), he has "entered the lists with his vizor down." We are strongly tempted to break a lance with him on every page of his so-called "Vindication," but shall confine ourselves in the first instance to what he has broached on the nature of angelic manifestations. After reading his thirty-ninth section, we could not repress an exclamation at the servility with which he has trodden in the steps of modern misbelievers. Once or twice, indeed, he admits his obligations to that storehouse of scepticism which we have noted at the head of this article; but if we are not very much mistaken, he has borrowed still more from Strauss, and not a little from the patriarch of semi-infidelity, we mean Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury. It is constantly affirmed in the "Leben Jesu," that the doctrine of angels and of diabolic agency is unsatisfactory to the minds of the enlightened pious; that the religious development of our own age revolts against any such dogma, nay, that one chief objection to the historicalness of certain Gospel narratives is found in their reiterated avowal of angelic apparitions. Strauss, also, like our English misbelievers, asserts most positively that the earliest systematic angelology among the Hebrews is dated from the time of Tobit, and that it is manifestly traceable to the influence of the Zendic mythology.

Hobbes has propounded his theory in the following passage of the "Leviathan," p. 211, ed. 1651:—

"And as the Gentiles did vulgarly conceive the imagery of the brain for things really subsistent without them, and not dependent on the fancy, and out of them framed their opinions of dæmons, good and evil . . . . so also the Jews upon the same ground, without any thing in the Old Testament that constrained them thereunto, had generally an opinion (except the sect of the Sadducees), that those apparitions which it pleased God sometimes to produce in the fancy of men, for his own service, and *therefore called them angels*, were substances not dependent on the fancy, but permanent creatures of God; whereof those which they thought were good to them, they esteemed the angels of God, and those they thought would hurt them, they called evil angels."

It is gratifying, however, to record, that even Hobbes had his lucid intervals, and was, in fact, far more orthodox than our own Protestant champion; for in a subsequent part of the same chapter he is constrained to make this confession:—

"Considering, therefore, the signification of the word 'angel' in the Old Testament, and the nature of dreams and visions that happen to men by the ordinary way of nature, I was inclined to this opinion, that angels were nothing but supernatural apparitions of the fancy, raised by the special and extraordinary operation of God, thereby to make his presence and commandments known to mankind, and chiefly to his own people. But the *many places of the New Testament*, and *our Saviour's own words*, and in such texts wherein is no suspicion of corruption of the Scripture, *have extorted from my feeble reason an acknowledgment and belief, that there be also angels substantial and permanent.*"—p. 214.

Let us now hear the Vindicator of "Protestant Principles," whom we shall find far outstripping both the Dean of Bristol and the philosopher of Malmesbury; while his points of contact with Strauss are many and unmistakeable:—

"When, after the Babylonish captivity, the Jewish doctors, corrupted by the superstitions of their heathen conquerors, had begun to regard these angelic manifestations of the Supreme Being as separate created intelligences, they were not long in finding names for the princes and leaders, whom in imitation of the Amshaspands of the Persians, they placed at the head of their Lord's host."—p. 76.

To render his meaning more clear, we must remark that, according to "Philelcutherus," there is no such being as a personal angel in the earlier books of the Old Testament; but that the term is constantly employed with reference to all manifestations of Jehovah, whether the medium of such manifestations be the powers of nature, a voice, a flame, or a visionary symbol. In other words, the doctrine of angels, as believed in the time of our Saviour, and since taught in His Church, is a corruption of primitive truth, an after-growth of Gentile mythology. But lest we should be supposed to misrepresent "Philelcutherus," he shall have the liberty of speaking for himself:—

"As this system of personification is not to be found in the older and more important (?) books of the Old Testament, and is indeed inconsistent with the representations which they give us respecting the origin of evil, and the dealings of God with the world in general, and with his Church in particular, it would have been unnecessary to say even thus much on the subject, had not the language of the Jews in our Lord's days been so *deeply tinctured with this superstitious phrase-*

ology, that He and His Apostles *were obliged to carry on what had become*, and in the opinion of some persons still is, *a necessary illusion*."—p. 77.

The clause of this sentence which we have italicized is so abhorrent to our feelings, that we almost hesitated to transcribe it; and yet even that is infinitely outdone by the heresy on the same page respecting "our Lord's struggle with His lower human nature" (i. e. His triumph in the desert over the arch-fiend Satan). We refrain, however, as before, from entering on this question, and would rather ascertain what notices exist in the more ancient of our sacred books respecting the personality and appearances of angels. In this way we hope most effectually to confute both the Dean of Bristol, the learned Phileleutherus, and the whole host of our smaller "thinkers," who "spend their time in nothing else but either to tell or to hear some new thing."

In pursuing this inquiry, we gratefully acknowledge our obligations to Dr. Mill's admirable "Christian Advocate" publications for 1840 and 1841, which "Phileleutherus" with characteristic self-complacency has pronounced "a well-meaning attempt to establish the superstitious theory," p. 167. A larger and more elaborate investigation is supplied by Ode's "Commentarius de Angelis," published at Utrecht in 1739[3].—Two remarks seem necessary in the outset:

(1.) If we may not argue, *à priori*, for the existence of superhuman beings, our belief in such intelligences involves no thought which is not perfectly in accordance with our convictions of the power, the majesty, the wisdom, or the goodness of the Almighty. Even with respect to those once-glorious beings who forfeited their Maker's blessing, "there is nothing in the circumstances or the consequence of their apostasy, or their wish to extend it to other beings, to which *human* analogies do not bear witness as antecedently credible."—*Mill's C. A. Publ. for* 1841, pp. 42, 43.

(2.) We premise, that the existence of like beings in any *Gentile* system can raise no just presumption, that *our* doctrine is an after-growth, or foreign importation: for we are standing upon ground which the latest deductions of ethnology have shown

[3] In his time also there was a "Vindex," like our "Phileleutherus," who maintained that certain opinions of Jews and Christians respecting angels were drawn from Gentile sources. This writer is named Daillonius, and his crotchets are appended to an "Apology for the Reformed Religion." Speaking of such sciolists, Ode remarks very truly: "Ac si modo fides habeatur Verbo Dei, tot huic deliramento reclamant testimonia rerumque documenta, ut mirum sit aut tam crassam ignorantiam, aut tam malitiosam temeritatem in ullis esse potuisse hominibus, *nedum illis, qui cæteris etiam sapientiores ac perspicaciores videri voluerunt.*"

to be still more tenable, when we affirm with the early Fathers, that *all Gentilism is a corruption of the one primeval creed*, and that as a consequence, almost necessarily resulting, we may expect to find very frequent parallelisms or affinities between the Old Testament and other systems[4]. On the particular question of the Zend-Avesta, we might assume even a still higher tone: for besides the strong doubts, which have been entertained respecting its genuineness and antiquity, the learned Prideaux urged with no little reason that its reputed author, Zerdusht, was himself "well versed in the sacred writings of the Jewish religion."—(*Connection*, i. 216; ed. 1718.) Waiving this, however, we affirm that the same argument which proves the Hebrew Satan to have been borrowed from the Persian Ahriman, would prove also his derivation from the Anglo-Saxon Grendel, or the Loki of Old Norse mythology.

With these preliminary suggestions, we turn to the books of the Old Testament, and inquire whether any indications of angelology had appeared among God's ancient people before they were brought into correspondence with the non-Semitic races.

And *first*, of the notices which have been afforded us respecting Satan and the powers of darkness.

No sooner have we commenced the history of man than we encounter the chief of reprobate angels, "the great dragon, *that old serpent* called the Devil and Satan." (Rev. xii. 9.) The circumstantial manner in which the fall is related, the minute geographical description of the scene, the absence of every intimation that the sacred penman was entering upon an allegory, the references made to that event as real by writers of the New Testament, and the fact that we are now experiencing the penalty which is there denounced upon our race—all seem to justify our conclusion that the obvious meaning of the narrative is also to be taken as the true meaning, and that man through extraneous solicitation, and not from the mere motions of concupiscence, was led to the commission of that sin by which he forfeited his native goodness. But who is the prime mover in this ruin? Something far more highly-gifted than either the common or the flying serpent, as must indeed have been self-evident to our first parents and to all the thoughtful among their posterity. "By the envy of the *devil*" (and nothing less) was death inflicted upon the world, and therefore when the Seed of the Woman was revealed, the Apostle could bid us look hopefully to the era when, in

[4] "Unde hæc, oro vos, philosophis aut poetis tam consimilia? nonnisi de nostris sacramentis: si de nostris sacramentis, ut de prioribus, ergo fideliora sunt nostra magisque credenda, quorum *imagines* quoque fidem inveniunt."—Tertull. Apol. c. xlvii.

execution of the curse denounced upon the serpent, our Lord would "bruise *Satan* under our feet." (Rom. xvi. 20.) It is true, that in the narrative of Moses, no *distinct* mention is made of diabolical agency; yet the indistinctness of his language on this subject is in no wise more singular or more perplexing than on other questions of equal moment. The desperate subtlety of the devil, and the inspired record of his triumph, might alike continue in partial obscurity ("adhuc tunc subnubila"), so long as the fuller revelation of the truth would have misled the undiscriminating many, so long (we may say without violence to the language) as "they were unable to bear it:" but no argument is thence fairly deducible in favour of our modern philosophers, who pretend that the idea of Satan, together with the whole group of imagery revolving round it, was a fabrication of later ages. We may cite in our behalf the very striking testimony of the Zend-Avesta, which our opponents on their assumption of its high antiquity will not, we hope, call in question. According to that record, the parents of the human family, Meshia and Meshianeh, were created by Ormuzd pure and upright; but *at the instigation of Ahriman*, who from the beginning sought only to deceive, they fell from their high estate by eating forbidden fruit. And elsewhere in the same book it is related how Ahriman sprung from heaven to earth in the very form of a serpent[5].

But testimony most decisive is afforded by the ancient book of Job, where Satan (emphatically *the* adversary) was unfolded to the Hebrew Church in all his guile and malice (i. 6—12; ii. 1—7). To escape from the cogency of these texts, our critics have recourse to various artifices no less weak than inconsistent. They first deny that the book of Job was written till the period of the Babylonish captivity; but this objection is at once repelled, by the purity of the language, (especially in the first and second chapters,) by the absence of all allusion to the Mosaic ritual, by the remoteness of sundry biographical notices, and by the unvarying witness of the Church. The second objection is still more fragile, viz., that the angel here called הַשָּׂטָן (*the* Satan) is rather a *holy* angel, endowed with the peculiar office of complainant or "censor morum;" for, besides the etymology of the name, (which to our philologers should be conclusive,) the malevolent character of the agent here mentioned renders him *identical* with Satan in 1 Chron. xxi. 1, and no less with the Satan of Zechariah iii. 1, 2, which was written after the captivity. By resorting, therefore,

[5] Quoted in Dr. Hengstenberg's "Christology," p. 15, ed. Arnold.

to such devices, our opponents have betrayed the hopelessness of their position, and, as it happens, not unfrequently, when bad men are hard pressed by siege or famine, they have rendered their fortunes still more desperate by turning their arms against each other:—

> "Nor needeth him no longer labour spend,
> His foes have slain themselves with whom he should contend."

Secondly. The evidence on which we base our assertion, that the Hebrews believed in the personality of *holy* angels, as well before as after the date of the captivity, will be found to be no less impregnable. "Phileleutherus" has indeed stated, that, "whenever an angelophany is described in those parts of the sacred volume, which are antecedent to the captivity, it is expressly represented as a manifestation of God Himself, and *not* as the appearance of *some independent and created intelligence;*" that is, if we understand him rightly, the later Jews fell into the universal error of regarding "the heavenly host" as *distinct* from the "Lord of hosts," instead of holding fast the patriarchal creed, to which all *personal* angels were unknown. We will not dwell upon the antecedent improbability which attaches to this novel speculation, nor upon the fact, on all hands admitted, that the Jews at this period of the captivity were effectually cured of their *polytheistic* tendencies: our best course, as before, will be to collect a few of those passages from the historical and earlier prophetical books, where the doctrine of personal angels is as clearly (if not as minutely) avowed, as in the age of our Lord and His Apostles.

"Angel-appearances" (we are translating Dr. Winer) "are represented *most* frequently in the legendary history of Genesis, and become less frequent as we advance." (*Realw.* i. 328.) "The *only* historical books which are quite free from angelology are those of Ezra and Nehemiah, written after the captivity." (*Ibid.*) This, we beg to remind our readers, is the testimony of an adversary, and tells with a peculiar force in favour of our own position. It directs us for the facts, which we are seeking, to that very quarter wherein, according to the theory of its author, we should be least likely to have found them; while it spares us the pains of examining those books, which we should naturally suspect, upon his hypothesis, to be full of the phenomena in question.

But are those early indications of angelic beings sufficiently *precise* and *personal?* "Phileleutherus," we have heard, would answer in the negative; and here, as in other cases, he is but echoing his German master, the author of the "Leben Jesu." If we turn, however, to the sacred volume, we shall not fail to be

amazed at the flippancy of writers, who could gratuitously put forth so weak a cavillation. When our first parents were expelled from Paradise, it is recorded that the Lord God "placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubims, and a flaming sword, which turned every way;" or, if we adopt the exposition of Kennicott, to which "Philelcutherus" does not seem averse, the passage would still affirm that the Almighty stationed "angels in a fiery appearance." Could language in either case be chosen more apt to inculcate the belief that the holy angels are distinct beings, personal and ministerial? And is not the same even more predicable of the "two angels," who were sent to Sodom (Gen. xix. 1), who, in fact, say expressly of their errand, "*the Lord* hath sent us to destroy it?" (ver. 13.) Or, again, in that wonderful vision of Jacob, (xxviii. 12,) where angels ascended and descended on the ladder, while "the Lord stood above it," do we not witness the ministrations of the self-same blessed spirits[6], who afterwards ascended and descended upon the Son of Man (John i. 51) in His temptation, and agony, and death, and resurrection, and ascension? Or, if we revert to the ancient book of Job, where we have already seen the prince of darkness prowling up and down in the earth, (ii. 2,) who, we ask, are those "sons of God," presenting themselves before the Lord, but personally distinct intelligences, who, on the birthday of this lower world, had shouted in joyful chorus, (xxxviii. 7,) and who still "execute God's commandment, and hearken unto the voice of His words?" (Ps. ciii. 20.) Or, if we pass over a long interval, which is no less fruitful in the materials we are collecting, our thoughts are still raised to the contemplation of Jehovah riding upon the cherubims, as in a triumphal chariot, with all the hosts of heaven, "even thousands of angels" encircling His glorious presence. (Ps. lxviii. 17.) In the vision of the prophet Isaiah, (vi. 1—7,) nearly two centuries before the exile, he beholds the Great King, the Lord of hosts, sitting upon a throne surmounted by the six-winged seraphim; while one of that blessed company, issuing forth on a message to the prophet, attests in the same act both his independent subsistence, and the nature of angelic ministrations. Or if, lastly, we consult the vision of Micaiah, not less anterior to the age when the Hebrews are said to have imbibed the sacred learning of the magi, we still find the same doctrine of the angelic hierarchy, which re-appears after the captivity, in the books of Daniel and Zechariah: "I saw the Lord sitting on His throne, and all the hosts of heaven standing

[6] The Vindicator of "Protestant Principles" speaking of the "phantasmagoria of Jacob's dream," conjectures that it was no more than "a bright stream of light glancing from heaven to earth."—p. 166. *Credat Judæus!*

by Him, on His right hand and on His left." (1 Kings xxii. 19—22. 2 Chron. xviii. 18—21.)

We would fain have expanded these remarks more fully, but our space is warning us to desist. Enough, however, has been advanced to refute the particular objections, which we have here undertaken to combat, viz., the absence of all precise teaching in the ante-Babylonic Scriptures, respecting the doctrine of good and evil angels, as held in the age of our Saviour; for we have shown that, in respect to both classes of superhuman intelligences, the chain of testimony, which extends to the very last vision of the Apocalypse, has its origin at the gates of Paradise. If any should still object,—that we have rather relieved the difficulty than removed it altogether, and have rather evinced the weakness of our opponents, than established an *absolute identity* of language in the several intimations of angels afforded by the Old Testament,—let them consider that even should the latest prophets have made some *additions* to the previous discoveries on this subject, such a gradual revelation of the truth should give no cause for perplexity to the pious student of the Scriptures, who in the whole order of the Divine economy, will observe the twilight ever deepening until the advent of the "Sun of righteousness."

In conclusion, we would recur, for a moment, to the writers who have more especially called forth the preceding observations. As was stated, in the outset, they both manifest a settled contempt for all ecclesiastical tradition; having realized, what the Germans would describe as an absolute "autonomy,"—a persuasion that truth is either yet undiscovered, or that, if it exist on earth, it has sprung from their own bosoms. We have, accordingly, little hope that our arguments will produce any salutary fruit in *them;* but we nevertheless feel it our solemn duty to warn all their readers of the poison which lies hid under their plausible pretences of "asserting the rights of educated manhood." Especially has the author of the "Vindication" established his previous claims to the distrust of every churchman; for, besides the incurable heterodoxy of his book, he has added sin to sin by putting it forth under a mendacious title. What he calls a "Vindication of Protestant Principles," is a vindication of no principle whatsoever: it is a profane assault upon *all* religion, if religion is aught more than a string of loose negations, or than a cluster of shifting nebulæ.

A "Vindication of *Protestant* Principles" forsooth! by an admirer of the "rationalistic" Melancthon! Had Melancthon left no other record of his principles than the "Augsburg Confession," to which "Phileleutherus" refers, he left enough to

convince all sober people of the horror with which he would have regarded the new generation of reformers. "Non enim aspernamur consensum Catholicæ Ecclesiæ," was his avowal for himself and his coadjutors, "nec est animus nobis ullum novum dogma et ignotum Sanctæ Ecclesiæ invehere in Ecclesiam." (Art. xxi. *apud Corpus Confess.* ed. Genev. 1612.) One reformer, indeed, there was, whom the vindicator *does* resemble; we mean, the fanatical Carlstadt, who, as early as the year 1520, (says Ranke,) "entertained doubts whether Moses was really the author of the books which bear his name, and whether the Gospels have come down to us in their genuine form." (Cf. *Vindication of Protestant Principles*, pp. 139. 168.) We must not, however, confound the hallucinations of this worthy with the principles of the reformers at large, any more than we should identify our own soi-disant champion with the cause of the English Church. As her Prayer Book protests daily against his errors in the "Te Deum," and weekly in the Preface to the "Ter Sanctus," and yearly in the "Festival of St. Michael and all Angels," so did his hero, Melancthon, by anticipation, repudiate his hollow homage, and denounce his narrow-minded self-idolatry. When the throes of the earlier Reformation had subsided, and Melancthon was left in his ripe old age to survey both the past and future, his apprehensions were transferred from the reviving struggle of the papacy to the seeds of neological unbelief, which even then were beginning to germinate. It was the sight of this lawless monster, threatening to uproot his labours, and to devastate the whole Church, which wrung from the great reformer the ever-memorable ejaculation[7]: "Video multo *intolerabiliorem esse tyrannidem* quam unquam fuit antea."

[7] We are indebted for this passage to a series of articles which have just appeared in the "Evangelische Kirchen-Zeitung." Their tone, notwithstanding its despondency here and there, gives us strong reason to hope that the theology of our German neighbours may even yet regain somewhat of healthiness and ancient truth.

Art. III.—*An Appeal to the Scottish Bishops and Clergy, and generally to the Church of their Communion.* Edinburgh: Alex. Lairne and Co.

Although the volume before us appears anonymously, so far as its title-page is concerned, the contents of the work itself, as well as the advertisements which have appeared in the public prints, enable us to ascribe the authorship to the Rev. W. Palmer, of Magdalen College, Oxford, deacon, whose name is already well known to the public in connexion with his publication on the Jerusalem bishopric, and his works on the doctrine of the Russian Church. The work before us is one of a somewhat multifarious character, amounting to 740 pages, octavo, considerable portions of which are printed in a very minute type; and comprising the contents of the author's journal, with large masses of correspondence extending over a period of about nine years, 1840—1849; during which, this deacon has been engaged in a series of conferences and negotiations, bearing on the question of the relations of the English and the Russian Church.

To enter in this place into any detailed account of these matters would be impossible; and were it possible, might be somewhat tedious: we shall however attempt a brief outline of the principal features of the transactions, as far as we can gather them from the complicated narrative before us.

It appears, then, that in 1840 Mr. Palmer went to St. Petersburg for the purpose of studying the character and tenets of the Russian Church, and, if practicable, of being admitted to the communion of that Church, without forsaking the Church of England. During his residence at St. Petersburg, he became acquainted with some Russian families of distinction, and amongst the rest, with a nobleman, who is designated as "Mr. A." Now, it so happened, that while Mr. Palmer was seeking communion with the Russian Church, on the ground that the English and the Russian Churches were one in faith, and branches of the same Catholic Church, the wife and daughters of this "Mr. A." had just separated from the communion of the Russian Church, and joined themselves to that of the Church of England; professing, moreover, doctrines very inconsistent with those which Mr. Palmer was announcing in Russia as the true doctrines of the Church of England; so that his position became

one of the most painful description, inasmuch, as his own Church appeared to disown practically the grounds on which he sought communion from the Russian Church; and he felt that he appeared in the light of an impostor.

Our author, finding himself in this embarrassing position, endeavoured to remove the difficulty, by denying that the ladies above referred to could have been received as converts by any *canonical authoritative* act of the English Church, and at the same time expressing his own strong disapprobation of the step which they had taken. Not content with this, he proceeded to use his best efforts, by correspondence, to induce these ladies to *re-unite* themselves to the Russian Church: with which view, he proceeded from St. Petersburg to Geneva, and subsequently to Paris; and although he failed in inducing the mother, Madame A., to separate from the English communion and re-unite herself to the Russian Church, he was successful in prevailing on one of the family to retrace her steps; and on her being reconciled to the Russian Church, a certain metropolitan was heard drily to remark, that "the Church was very much obliged to that Anglican deacon."

Madame A., as we have observed, proved refractory, and could not be induced either by the arguments or the measures of the deacon (who on one occasion succeeded in obtaining her rejection from communion by the English chaplain at St. Petersburg) to re-unite herself to the Russian Church; and the whole of this volume turns on the contest between this lady and the deacon, in which the latter appears to have been, notwithstanding the firmest resolution and the most indefatigable zeal, finally and completely worsted. The lady appears to remain in communion with the Church of England, having made her ground good by appeals to various authorities in the Church; and our author has been unsuccessful in his different attempts to exclude her from our communion. So that, on the whole, we fear, he has placed himself in a position from which he can only extricate himself with consistency, by being reconciled to the Greek Church—an event which some portions of the work before us show to be at hand.

The whole story is really a curious one—rather lengthy, indeed, and abounding in superfluous details, which render the narrative confused and intricate to the last degree—but still the whole thing is extremely curious and interesting. In speaking thus, we know, of course, that there are many questions of the deepest *importance* discussed in the work before us, and that the real great object throughout was one of the highest and holiest that man can put before him—the re-union of nations in Chris-

tian love and faith. But still, as a whole, the book is the *Journal Book* of an indefatigable, ingenious, pious, learned, and indiscreet man, containing all kinds of miscellaneous information and anecdotes about the proceedings, writings, thoughts, correspondence, and adventures of the writer; and this, while it adds in one point of view to the interest of the production, yet on the other side, detracts from the dignity and gravity of the more important parts of the work. We think it rather unfortunate, moreover, that the whole affair and the book should have been made to take so personal a form; that the deacon and Madame A. should be in such perpetual struggle before our eyes; and that the more solemn topics of the work should be so much mixed up with the obstinacy, or petulance, or other improprieties of this or that individual. We would rather not, for instance, see such anecdotes as the following, which decidedly detract from the gravity of the work.

"A few hours later (that is, on the same day, after the conversation with the Primus) the Bishop of Glasgow good-naturedly observed [to the author], 'We were sorry for not having your company yesterday at dinner; but I think you did right in not coming after all . . . I confess, I don't think you owe us, the bishops, any thanks. What passed was unpleasant to my feelings; but we should do just the same, if we had to do it over again. We shall be very happy to see you even if you *do* come back to us with a beard, though then you'll be a *barb*arian."—pp. 333, 334.

Now really, amusing as such an anecdote is, we would rather not see it in such a book, and more especially because it conveys irresistibly to the mind, that the Bishop of Glasgow was actually jocose upon the author, as if he were a fit subject for jesting; and the effect of such an anecdote is, either to show an unseemly levity in a bishop, or else to create an impression very far remote from the respect which is due to the author's zeal and ability.

We have already remarked that our author, in 1840, was placed in very embarrassing circumstances, at St. Petersburg, on hearing that Madame A. had been received into communion with the English Church. The case appears to have been, that this lady and her daughters, having been resident at Geneva for some time, had been led, by communications with some dissenters, to adopt, what are called, "evangelical" views of a low description; but ultimately she preferred to join the communion of the English Church, and accordingly presented herself, and was received to communion by the English chaplain there.

After various conferences with our author, Mr. A. (the husband of the lady referred to) addressed a letter to the late Arch-

bishop of Canterbury, soliciting from him a reply to various questions on points in the English Canon Law, affecting the relations of the English and Russian Church. This letter was *not answered;* and the fact of its not being answered, appears to have excited great surprise in the mind of Mr. A., and to have been viewed by our author as an encouragement to the course taken by Madame A. For our own parts, we should scarcely think it reasonable to expect from the primate of the English Church a declaration of "the opinion of the Church transmitted through her primate" (p. lxxxix.) on the mere requisition of an individual, who sought it on the ground of "the question touching so closely both on his own *happiness* and that of other members of his family." Were the primate obliged to give answers on difficult points of Canon Law to every foreigner who might think it conducive to his family "happiness" to obtain information on such matters, his office would certainly be no sinecure. We presume, that the primate was of opinion, that such questions could only be answered in the name of the Church by a synod; and that, in the absence of such authority, the most proper person to apply to would be an ecclesiastical lawyer. In truth, the questions were of such a nature, that the archbishop would, we think, have acted not unwisely in declining any *authoritative* declaration on them, without previous synodical conference with other prelates and theologians.

Mr. A., having failed in obtaining from the primate a response favourable to his views, by which he had hoped to convince his wife of the impropriety of her leaving the Russian Church; our author next endeavoured to extract from the Bishop of London a condemnation of the course pursued by the chaplain at Geneva in admitting Madame A. to communion. We have (pp. cv—cix) a long letter from our author to the bishop, comprising a full and minute account of his visit to St. Petersburg, with the object of promoting the union of the English and Russian Church, and the principal conversations that had passed on the subject, together with a statement of Madame A.'s defection to the Church of England, and the expression of an opinion, that it would much conduce to the restoration of union with the Greek Church, if the acts of the chaplain at Geneva could be disavowed by ecclesiastical authority. In reply to this letter, the Bishop of London, after making inquiries of the chaplain referred to, expressed his opinion, that, under the circumstances of the case, the lady having satisfied the chaplain on her religious principles, and on the grounds on which she had determined to leave her own Church, the chaplain was not at liberty to refuse her admission to communion; that "if there be a fundamental difference between the

Greek Church and our own, there must be, in our judgment, good reason for a person's seeking to be admitted to our communion; but if not, there is no reason why the members of one Church should not be admitted to communicate in another." (p. cx.) In a subsequent communication the bishop stated his opinion, that "if a person of good life and conversation presents himself to a clergyman of the Church of England, declaring his assent to the doctrines of that Church, and desiring to be admitted as a communicant, I conceive that it is the duty of that clergyman to admit him. Whether he is a convert from any other Church or not, is a question which concerns the conscience of the party himself, but which the clergyman, admitting him to communion, is not called upon to determine." (p. cxii.)

This language appears to us deficient in precision, and liable to inferences which the bishop could scarcely have intended to approve. We are of opinion, that the principle laid down without any limitation, that "whether he is a *convert* from any other Church or *not*, is a question which concerns only the party himself," is, as thus laid down, one which cannot be safely sustained, inasmuch as it would permit a clergyman to admit at any time to communion, any member of a dissenting community who might wish to receive the sacrament in the English Church, without forsaking his own communion, provided he were able to assent to the doctrines of the Church of England. And thus it would sanction a clergyman in doing what he is *forbidden* to do by the Canons of the Church. There are a number of errors and faults condemned in some of the first twelve Canons of 1603, which ought to exclude certain persons from the communion of the Church of England, even if they were willing to receive that communion; and by Canons XXVII. and XXVIII. not only are open sectarians to be refused communion on pain of suspension, but even those who desert the communion in an adjoining parish are to be refused, and remitted back to their own parish for communion. Nor is it to be said, that a clergyman of the Church of England is bound to admit to communion any person who has not hitherto been received to communion, merely if that person declares "his assent to the doctrines of that Church," although he may know him to hold some decided heresy, and, perhaps, to identify that error with the doctrines of the Church of England. We are persuaded that the Bishop of London could not have intended to maintain any such positions as these. He could not have intended to be understood as sanctioning a clergyman of the Church of England in receiving to communion a person who was known by himself to be guilty of *schism*, in separating himself from the communion of his own priest or

bishop; or of any such grievous offence. We think it would not be reasonable to suppose that the bishop could have intended to sanction any such doctrines, which might perhaps be gathered from the mere wording of his letter; and though it would have been desirable that his expressions should have been more carefully limited, still we must remember that the letter was a private letter addressed to a private clergyman, and, therefore, perhaps, expressed with less precision than if it had been meant for publication. The terms in which the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London concurred, in giving Dr. Tomlinson letters to the Eastern Church, and subsequently in the arrangements consequent on the establishment of the Jerusalem bishopric, prove that it was not the intention of those prelates to promote or encourage secessions from the Oriental Church.

But, after all, when we come to the real question at issue, whether it is or is not allowable to receive persons to the communion of the Church of England, who may wish to leave the communion of the Russian Church on certain grounds of objection to some of its practices or tenets, and of preference for those of the tenets of the English Church, it must be confessed that the question is a complicated one; and we must express an opinion, that it is one on which good men may think somewhat differently. In the first place, there is this consideration to be attended to,—that if there be a diversity of view and practice on such a question in the English Church, the Russian Church herself is not agreed in theory on the question, whether the Oriental Church is indeed the whole Catholic Church, or only a part of it; and, therefore, whether the members of the English and the Roman Churches should be received as orthodox, or as heretics. On this great point in theory, the Russian Church is as much divided, as the English can possibly be as to its view of the Russian Church and its doctrines; though in *practice* it appears at present (in Russia, at least) that no one is received from the Latin or the English Church, to their communion, except as a heretic, after anathematizing the alleged heresies of his own communion. Now, this being the case, it is plain that there is so much estrangement and misunderstanding between the Churches, that it is impossible to apply the ordinary rules of the intercommunion of Churches where communion is in actual operation. Indeed, the fact is, that, as things are at present, *a person cannot be received from the Russian communion without forsaking the Russian communion;* for, those who are of the English communion are not recognized by the authorities as of the Russian, until after they have pronounced anathema on the English communion as heretical. Thus, then, the fact of joining the English communion is in the eyes of the

present ecclesiastical authorities of Russia, an act which cuts a person off *ipso facto* from their communion; but in this they are certainly in grave error, and act schismatically; nor does it seem reasonable, that, through *their error and schism*, any persons should be prevented from uniting themselves to what we ourselves know and believe to be an orthodox, and apostolical, and catholic branch of the Church of Christ. Madame A. might have held errors on various points; but, as far as relates to the mere question of her *forsaking* the communion of the Church of Russia for that of England, she appears to have understood the principles of her own Church better than the deacon her antagonist; and to have felt, that, in holding communion with the Church of England, she was *obliged* to leave that of Russia; and, putting aside the particular views of Madame A. or their mode of expression, we would say, that if a person united himself to the Church of England, and were virtually cut off from the Church of Russia by so doing, and if that person were to avow that he *preferred* the tenets of the Church of England to those of the Russian Church, and that he thought the latter in some points unscriptural, superstitious, or erroneous, there could be no reason, merely on this account, unless his doctrines should be actually contrary to those of the Church of England, to refuse him communion. It would be a different case if he were a member of a Church which was in direct communion with us as a formally-recognized part of the Christian body; it would be inconsistent and schismatical to receive any one as a convert from such a body; e. g. from the Irish, Scottish, or American Churches; but here the case is different. Here was an instance in which there were two opposed duties prescribed by Christian charity. One duty was to enter into communion with that English Church which was believed to be Christian; another duty was to remain united with the Church in which the person had been baptized; but then this latter Church not only *prohibited* the discharge of the duty of Christian charity towards the former, but did so on the ground of differences in practice and doctrines in which she herself was decidedly in the *wrong* for the most part. Now, in a case of this kind we think that the claims of the former communion preponderate; and that a person is free from blame who acts on his conviction of the doctrinal truth of the branch of the Church to which he unites himself, and is sound in his view of that truth; even though in so doing he forsakes virtually the communion in which he has been baptized.

It appears to us, that Mr. Palmer, throughout this whole transaction, proceeded on a hypothesis, which was not borne out by fact. He appears to have gone to Russia, with the real

intention of restoring the communion which has been interrupted between the Eastern and Western Church; but he went to work, as it appears to us, ignoring the fact of such an interruption, and claimed communion as from a Church essentially united to his own. He appears to have been unprepared for the view which he found prevalent in high quarters, that the English Church was "Luthero-Calvinistic," and that her members should not be regarded as entitled to communicate with the Eastern Church. He proceeded with Madame A. and her daughters, as guilty of schism, in separating from the Russian Church, and uniting themselves to the English, exactly as if the Russian and English Churches had been in full communion. Having succeeded in persuading one of these ladies to join herself to the Russian Church again, he had the mortification of finding that this very young lady was, on her reception into the Russian Church, compelled virtually to condemn the English as heretical, and to separate from its communion. And yet he still proceeded to claim communion from the synod of the Russian Church, as if there were no kind of established principle to prevent his reception. We must confess, that, after examining the case between Mr. Palmer and Madame A., it seems to us, that the proceedings of the former ignored altogether the facts of the interruption of communion and its causes, or else were carried on without a sufficient acquaintance with the real state of things; and, as far as the conduct of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, and the Chaplain of Geneva, was concerned, we think that they had more reason on their side than our author, and that they looked more at the actual state of the case, than he appears to have done. They saw that the case was not so simple as our author thought. He proceeded to work straightforward, as if the Russian and the English Churches were just in the same relations to us as the Irish or the Scottish Churches. But these prelates saw, and rightly saw, the case in a different point of view, and looked at it somewhat more practically than our author. We do not say that the question was without difficulty, or that it was capable of a settlement which would have been thoroughly satisfactory, or which would have completely reconciled all apparent or real duties in different directions; but we do think that Mr. Palmer was much more evidently mistaken in his view of the matter, than Madame A. or the Genevan Chaplain.

Of course we put aside the particular details of Madame A.'s views. We dislike several of her expressions and tenets, as far as we understand them, and do not consider them consistent with truth; but this has nothing to do with the general question, whether a member of the Russian may be received to the English

communion as a convert; i. e., as disapproving of some tenets and practices of the Russian, and acknowledging contrary truths in the English Church.

It is a *fact*—a lamentable fact—that the Universal Church is divided in communion; and that errors and superstitions of various kinds prevail in various parts. We do not pretend to exemption from all fault in our own Church: our discipline is decidedly defective; yet we trust that, whatever our faults may be, our branch of the Catholic Church is, at least, equal, on the whole, to any other branch; and we do distinctly see many points in which she evinces a more faithful zeal for the Gospel of Jesus Christ, than other Churches do. We find her far more jealous of the purity of the worship of the true God than other Churches are—more hostile to heathen and idolatrous principles and practices—less carnal in her conceptions of Religion. And we have a duty to this Church, and through her to the Gospel itself—not to give way by subjection to any who seek dominion over our faith, as if the Gospel came unto them only or proceeded forth from them—but to maintain openly, and in the face of the Christian world, those truths which are taught by the Church of England, and which have been forgotten, corrupted, or explained away in the Churches of Russia or of Rome.

It is our fixed opinion, that the blessing of God can never be expected to rest on any attempts to promote the union of Christians, which proceed on any compromise of great truths. The union of the Church is most earnestly to be desired; but we believe that it is best promoted by the acquisition of more knowledge and greater enlightenment, combined with a fidelity to known and acknowledged truth; and we have no confidence in the success of any direct attempts which individuals or even Churches may make *at present*, for the attainment of that desirable object.

In the instance of the learned and ingenious individual whose attempts are recorded in the volume before us, we think the circumstances under which the attempt was made, afforded little reasonable prospect of success. Here was a private individual —a Deacon of the Church of England, who went to Russia seeking for communion with the Russian Church. He was at once rejected, on the plea that he had not brought with him the letters commendatory of his Bishop. He afterwards appeared again in the character of a deacon, deputed by Bishop Luscombe of Paris, with letters commendatory to all Catholic Bishops, asking them to admit him to communion in their dioceses. These commendatory letters were subsequently altered, and erasures made in them with Bishop Luscombe's consent, which in itself was rather an untoward circumstance. Besides this, it happened most

unluckily, that just as the Deacon was expounding his view of the Catholic and Apostolic character of the English Church, in the way calculated to present her most favourably to the Russians, a volume of sermons by Bishop Luscombe himself was put by Madame A. into the hands of those who were in authority, in which that worthy prelate made a vigorous and perhaps not very well-judged onslaught on the doctrines of Romanism, in such a way as grievously scandalized the Russian authorities. So that our author was again placed in the disagreeable predicament of having the authorities of his own Church quoted against his explanations of her doctrines. The Synod had just before this refused to enter on his case, because the application of "a single deacon," backed by the letters of "a single Bishop," as expressing only the opinions of individuals, was not matter of synodal deliberation, and the British Church had not expressed by any synodal act a desire for the restoration of communion. On being applied to by the author to appoint a person to reconcile him to the Greek Church, provided his heresies could be pointed out, a certain Archpriest was selected by the synod, who coolly went to work on the assumption, that the English Church was heretical, and that our author must confess it to be so, before he could be received into the Russian communion, and he grounded his charges especially on the works of our author's *own bishop*, whose letters commendatory he bore. Thus attacked, our author endeavoured to establish his orthodoxy to the satisfaction of the Archpriest, by pronouncing anathema on a number of doctrines of the Lutherans, Calvinists, and others; but was assured that all would not do, unless he acknowledged that the English Church held these heresies. Our author, then, had no remedy left, but to appeal to the Bishops of his own Church, to declare whether he had not done right in saying anathema to those doctrines and tenets; and so he left Russia to obtain a sanction for his anathemas from the Bishops of Scotland.

Our author is, perhaps, too ready to resort to anathemas, which he has, before now, introduced at times and under circumstances in which they were not understood. In truth, anathemas are not quite as customary now as they were twelve hundred years ago—at least in the mouths of private individuals; and what might be awful and solemn even now, if denounced by the authority of a great synod on some great occasion, is only regarded as presumptuous or uncharitable when volunteered by a private person. Anathemas are not lightly to be thrown out: they are only to be used when there is some grievous false doctrine invading the Church, and there is prospect of benefit from their use.

In 1846, our author, duly fortified with letters from Bishop Luscombe, which appear pretty plainly to have been written while the Deacon was at his elbow, landed in Scotland, and proceeded to lay before the Scottish Bishops his appeal, requesting them to support him by their authority in the course he had taken in anathematizing certain doctrines, and also to agree to certain Articles of discipline which he had drawn up, and which he wished to have sanctioned by synodical authority.

Now, without doubt, it would have been some aid to Mr. Palmer's object, had the synod of Scottish Bishops been induced to give synodical authority to the string of anathemas which he had uttered before the Archpriest in St. Petersburg. It would have given weight to his representations of the real character of the English Church, and would have relieved him from the imputation of merely advancing his individual view of the question. But then, on the other hand, the matter may have appeared in a different view to the Scottish Bishops. They probably looked on Mr. Palmer as in some degree a visionary; and they did not feel that there was any particular obligation upon them to enter on the questions at issue between him and the Archpriest, or Madame A. They did not recognize in this individual deacon of the Church of England, or of Bishop Luscombe, or apparently even in Bishop Luscombe himself, any such claim or authority as should induce them to enter on the thorny discussion, in which our deacon proposed to engage them. There might be various prudential considerations connected with the state of their own Churches, which might induce them to think it more prudent not to volunteer a series of definitions on doctrines such as Mr. Palmer put before them. They might feel, and we think justly feel, that there was something objectionable in placing before them a lengthened series of propositions composed by a stranger, and calling on them to pronounce whether these propositions were right or wrong. In the Articles of discipline too, there were passages which indirectly conveyed the strongest censure on the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London. On the whole, the Scottish Bishops, as might have been expected, paid very little attention to the matter of the appeal, contenting themselves with denying the right of the deacon, as deputy of Bishop Luscombe, or even of Bishop Luscombe himself, to any place in the synod; and not even entering on the examination of the propositions which Mr. Palmer was anxious to have approved by them.

We do really think, that the Scottish Bishops cannot be blamed for not entering on the examination of these propositions. They have quite enough on their hands to occupy their attention,

without opening up new difficulties and causes of discussion. The propositions against which Mr. Palmer denounced anathema, are in some instances couched in such language, or invite such questions, as may very fairly make any one in authority pause before he passes an opinion upon them. It appears to us that several of the points which Mr. Palmer has anathematized, are not deserving of so strong a censure. Besides this, synods of bishops, when they *do* proceed to condemn doctrines, may fairly claim the right of employing their own language, and of not being tied down to that of any particular individual. We think that Mr. Palmer's anathemas in various instances raise into articles of faith what are, after all, only opinions more or less tolerable; and it does not at all follow, that because he might have somewhat hastily, and without consultation with persons in authority, committed himself to particular language on many doctrinal subjects, the Scottish Bishops were to engage themselves in discussions on his propositions.

It would not have been sufficient for his purpose, if the Scottish Bishops had merely declared that Mr. Palmer's anathemas did not cut him off from the Church; because the objection would still have been made by the Greek Church that such a declaration might imply a toleration of opinions directly contrary to his. Nor, again, would it have promoted his object, if some of his anathemas had been approved and some disapproved, which would probably have been the case if an actual examination had been made of his propositions. So that, on the whole, we think the Scottish Bishops have acted most discreetly, and most in furtherance of Mr. Palmer's real objects, by refusing to take his propositions into consideration.

The truth is, that our author, with the best possible intentions, undertook a task which was somewhat above his power. He appears to have supposed that every one in the world would enter into his designs and plans with an ardour and interest equal to his own; and he was not prepared for the difficulties, delays, and caution of elder men, who either did not see so far as he did, or perhaps saw somewhat further, and were unwilling to embark in negotiations for the union of Churches under his guidance. It seems not to have occurred to his sanguine mind that the Bishops of Scotland might refuse to examine or act on his appeal, or he would perhaps scarcely have committed himself in the way related in the following passage, which records his reply to the Archpriest above-mentioned, on the latter pressing him to "anathematize the Thirty-nine Articles as being manifestly heretical, and together with them, the Bishop from whom I came, and his Church."

"I answered that I had done my duty, as I hoped, by professing that truth which I had learned from the British Church, according to the measure of my knowledge and ability, and by saying anathema to the contrary heresies, at the bidding of the Eastern Church: that if any positive doubt existed as to the Bishop from whom I came, and his Church, whether they had really taught me in the Thirty-nine Articles, or otherwise, that truth which I professed to have learned from them, or those contrary heresies to which I had said anathema, my necessary and only course was to appeal back to the Bishop from whom I had come, and to his Church . . . that for these reasons I appealed to the Bishop from whom I had come, and to the synod of the Scottish Bishops who consecrated him: that if they owned and approved that confession of our faith which I had made in Russia, I could not reasonably be blamed for having refused to anathematize a Church which turned out to be orthodox: but if, on the other hand, they either allowed those heresies which the Russian synod objected to me, and which I had anathematized, to be the true sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, *or attempted by an evasive silence to yoke faith and heresy together*, I would return to Russia, and seek to be reconciled by the prescribed form from the Scottish Church, as from heresy."—p. 282.

We must be permitted to express our regret, that the writer before us should have allowed himself to commit so great an act of imprudence as is here related. We think that he had no right to assume that the Scottish Bishops *must speak* at his demand, and pronounce judgment on a set of propositions placed before them by him, on the alternative of his separating himself from their communion as heretics! We must say that this strikes us as in no small degree presumptuous, in dictating to the synod of Bishops of a National Church, what their course of action should be, under penalty of being regarded as *heretics*. One would think that the writer, instead of being a deacon in the Church, claimed *papal* authority; for really nothing less could obviate the charge of extreme presumption. We very much regret to be obliged to speak thus: but we cannot help expressing some surprise at the mode in which this deacon has thought himself authorized to deal with the chief rulers of the Church; and we are disposed to think that one who could thus act, was deficient in judgment, at least. His conduct, indeed, appears to have been, in various instances, precipitate, though his zeal and ingenuity were undoubtedly great.

From the above passage it will appear that Mr. Palmer has pledged himself, that if his appeal is not received and supported by the Bishops of Scotland, he will be reconciled to the Oriental Church, as a convert from the Scottish Church. His appeal has, as we learn from the volume before us, been set aside or not supported; so that we suppose we may expect shortly to hear of the

fulfilment of his promise. One very significant action is repeatedly referred to in this volume—the declaration of the author, that he has arrived at the conviction that on one important point the doctrine of the Greek Church is irreconcilable with that of the English, namely, in the procession of the Holy Ghost; and that the Greek Church is right, and the Latin Church wrong! We presume, therefore, that our author will not long continue a deacon of the *English* Church. The author goes so far as to express his opinion in a letter to the Archpriest, which he has published in his Appeal, that the Western Church (including the English and Scottish Churches) "persists obstinately in maintaining a formal heresy, as far as the expression goes," by using the addition "*Filioque*" in the Creed; and that she "is justly rejected by the Eastern Church from her communion, until she return to the œcumenical standard of faith," (p. 433.) So that he tells the Scottish Church, in the Appeal which he makes for its judgment in his favour, that it is *heretical* on the doctrine of the procession; and that he is of opinion that it is rightly excommunicated by the Eastern Church. We certainly do marvel that, under these circumstances, our author should have appealed to the Scottish Church, as *his* Church, or as possessing any authority; and with his present views we presume that *he* is of opinion that it is of very little consequence whether Russians are admitted as converts, or as members of a sister Church, to our communion; because either act would be wrong. If the English Church teach heresy, and is "rightly excommunicated," it is not, of course, lawful to communicate with it at all.

To pass on, however, from the author's personal views or actions to a more general question, *the result of his exertions on the whole.* We think it must be admitted by every one, that Mr. Palmer has not only evinced an energy and perseverance in pursuit of a very great object, which entitles him to the most cordial sympathy and respect, notwithstanding his defects of judgment on some points; but has actually materially promoted the object which he had in view. It is true that he has failed in being actually admitted on his own terms into communion with the Russian Church; but the time has evidently not yet come for the realization of communion by any such act; much remains to be done before it can be successful. On the other hand, as far as Mr. Palmer's case is concerned, it does not seem that he has been refused communion in such a way as increases the difficulties and obstacles, but rather the reverse. While, in addition, a very large amount of information has been obtained and circulated in both countries, which will, we trust, prepare the way for future negotiations. At present it appears to us that the

English Church is herself deficient in so many particulars, that she can scarcely have the weight with other parts of the universal Church less doctrinally pure than she is, which would suffice to place in security her principles, which ought not to be compromised, and could not be compromised without sin. While our discipline generally is so much relaxed, and sin is so rarely reproved,—while the spirit of worldliness is, by means of patronage, so much and widely disseminated amongst us, we could not have, in conference with the Orientals, sufficient moral vigour to require the reform of superstitions which prevail amongst them, and which we ought not to recognize. And, in fine, until we have obtained some degree of liberty for the Church, so as to be able to proceed regularly and synodically for the reform of abuses in our own Church, and for the restoration of communion with other Churches, it would be quite hopeless to attempt any direct negotiations with foreign communities.

ART. IV.—*The Caxtons, a Family Picture. By Sir* E. BULWER LYTTON, *Bart., Author of "Rienzi, &c."* Blackwood. 1849.

A VERY charming work has Sir Edward herein presented to us: whether a great one or no, we cannot so easily undertake to decide; whether beneficial or injurious, from a moral point of view, is a point perhaps still more open to question. All the well-known Bulwerian "agréments" are here: first, that charm of style so pre-eminently characteristic of this conscientious artist;—conscientious, that is, as far as the intellectual labour is concerned, requisite for the completeness of any artistic creation. Then, too, we have humour—humour of an amiable and kindly nature, scarcely Shakspearian, but indubitably Sterne-like; and we have that gentle pathos, which from true humour lies never far:

"Erin, the smile and the tear in thine eye!"

And equally conspicuous is that intimate knowledge of society, more especially in so-called "high life," which our author exhibited in his first successful production, "Pelham," now matured, and further elevated, by the influence of a more sober philosophy than Sir Edward had then attained unto: not but that this philosophy is still irregular and vague. We shall not find here the wild grandeur of the rich and southern "Zanoni," a wierd hymn to the mystical, as its chanter would perhaps be pleased to designate it, nor the truly exquisite beauty, the high poetry, of that one creation of our author's, which has been more or less slighted as a picture- or a lady's-book, but which will certainly live and be treasured with delight, when many of his more ambitious achievements are forgotten: we mean, "The Pilgrims of the Rhine." For, be it remarked, that Sir Edward, generally so prosaic in his miscalled poetry, is often a true, ay, and a great poet in his prose! There is a flowing cadence in his exquisitely balanced sentences, which has ever a mystic charm for the soul, almost equalling the musical effects of our most favoured bards, only inferior to them in that concentration of thought and expression, which stamps the poet "par éminence," and must ever be his more especial heritage. There is a sentence in this very book before us, which may exemplify our meaning. On page 133 of the first volume we read: "It is not study alone

that produces a writer: it is *intensity*. In the mind, as in yonder chimney, to make the fire burn hot and quick, you must narrow the draught." Now, should not our author be conscious that his draught is not thus narrowed? that this hotness and quickness are wanting to him? and that consequently he can never be a poet, in the literal sense of the term? But to return to our more immediate theme. In "The Caxtons," Sir Edward has again yielded another evidence of his amazing versatility; though in that versatility there remains not only a secret, but even an apparent, unity: for we, for our own part, detected our author before we had read three pages of this last tale of his, when appearing anonymously in Blackwood's Magazine, though we have heard other folks declare that they never should have therein recognized his intellectual handiwork. This declaration surprises us; for we find almost as many of the old faults as of the old beauties in this production. Here is that love for melodramatic effects, which will scarcely ever rest satisfied without ending a chapter with a note of admiration! here, too, is that fond display of recondite learning or odd reading, call it what you may, which was ever one of our author's foibles: here is the occasional bigness of utterance and puffiness of phrase, which betray the too manifest ambition to "say something very fine indeed:" here, to wind up our catalogue of grievances for the present, is that faint and shadowy philosophy,—which seems to hover between heaven and hell, not far from Milton's "Limbo,"—which establishes the unhappy certainty of the fact, that Sir Edward is so far subject to "the spirit of his age" as to be, like his own "Trevanion," without "a conviction."

This circumstance alone, in the eyes of some, perhaps of many, should prevent any lenient treatment on our part of this highly talented "man of the nineteenth century." But we believe charity to be the safer guide in this, and many instances, than too stern and too negative an orthodoxy. No doubt we must adhere to truth, but then truth is by no means so *limited* in such cases as some people imagine it. Our sentence would *not* be that of truth, but only that of bigotry, were we to denounce "The Caxtons" as a directly antichristian work; and yet there is much in it which *is* antichristian, and which we shall feel it our duty to reprehend severely. But shall we close our eyes to the real merits of the work before us, because it contains much of which we must highly disapprove? Shall we therefore ignore the humour, the pathos, the grace, the elegance, the knowledge of the human heart in many aspects, the partial healthfulness of tone, which *are* therein displayed? A landscape may be devoid of sunshine,—

(every moral landscape *must* be, on which the Sun of Righteousness shines not,)—and yet the stars may shed their beams there with a softened light, a light derived from the great absent luminary; and thus those Christian graces of sincerity, loving-kindness, meekness, endurance, and love, which are manifested in the various characters that occupy our author's scene, may well evoke our sympathy, reminding us Christians, indirectly, as they must do, of the very Fountain of all graces. For much may be religious, ay, and Christian in effect, which is not directly and professedly so; and, with all its deficiencies, its morbid sentimentality, and its very shadowy philosophizing, the novel-literature of our own age and country is *not* deficient in this *religiosity* (we dislike coined words, but this serves our purpose for the nonce); less deficient certainly than that of any *other* age or country; which is not saying much!

We have recently devoted some pages to the recognition of these good purposes and honest intentions in our two great living humorists, Dickens and Thackeray, the former of whom is now presenting us with a delightful work. We are much pleased, by the bye, with the total absence of mean jealousy or envy, displayed by Sir Edward Lytton in occasional references to his great contemporary's creations. Thus we find in the second volume of "The Caxtons," "Are there any of you, my readers, who have not read the Life of Robert Hall? If so, *in the words of the great Captain Cuttle*, 'When found, make a note of it!'" And again in the third volume, "The apparition showed me my way in the rocks to the great '*Battle of Life*.'" Such references are alike honourable to the praiser and the praised; and to us they were the more welcome because we laboured under an indefinite impression, derived, we think, from a certain preface to a very silly novel of Mr. James's, yclept "The Stepmother," that he and Sir Edward had arrived at the conclusion that Mr. Dickens was wholly devoid of humour; which, be it said without offence, would be, like the frog and the crickets agreeing that the nightingale had no voice. The joke may seem a strange one, but one of our most respectable contemporaries, with whom on many points we sympathize sincerely, and whose earnestness and high spirit we very gladly acknowledge, "The Morning Post," is decidedly of this opinion, that Mr. Dickens has no humour whatever, and has not hesitated to express it frequently. After all, every body cannot be expected to understand a joke, and "Pickwick" *may* only be a theme for grave reflection and awful censure with certain earnest and true-hearted philosophers, to whom we may still wish God speed! Meanwhile, we are delighted

to exonerate our old friend Bulwer—friend in a literary sense—from any tendencies to envy; more especially as we are bound to acknowledge that his trial has been severe. Until Dickens soared into our novel hemisphere, Sir Edward, or rather let us say "Bulwer," reigned supreme. "Facilè princeps" was he, since the decease of the northern wizard: his last new book, whatever it might be, was the all but exclusive theme of novel-readers' tongues; no man was so much written about, whether for praise or censure; no man so prominently occupied the public literary mind. Then came a change, a startling change. The mirth-inspiring "Pickwick" started into being, and Bulwerian philosophy sank awhile into the shade. Was not this a trial, and might not a passing bitterness be pardoned? If we mistake not, a glimpse of some such feeling was afforded us in that very clever and very interesting production, "Night and Morning:" but here, if ever, is the place to say, "Let bygones be bygones:" surely, "All is well that ends well."

So, to resume the thread of our discourse, (we own that we are too discursive,) our existing novel-literature is not wholly unworthy of a Christian's regard. True charity and lowly-mindedness (remember "Pinch" and "Cuttle") are the virtues Mr. Dickens delineates with most sympathy and delight; and Mr. Thackeray discharges a less pleasing, but not less needful, duty in painting the world of society as it is, and turning it inside out, with all its meanness, and selfishness, and folly. Then we have the thoroughly English manliness and high honour of "James," which never shrinks from the avowal of religious sentiment wherever needed. By the bye, Mr. James is absurdly underrated by some of our contemporaries, "The Athenæum" and that small crew: we may strive to do justice some day to the author of "Attila," "The Gipsy," and "Morley Ernstein." Would he only emulate Sir Edward's external graces, would he only resolve never to write without a *purpose*, would he only be a conscientious artist, in a word,—which is a very different thing from being a conscientious man,—why then, he might take and hold his post among the foremost of our standard novelists! Then we have Mrs. Marsh, whose Emilia Wyndham is surely indirectly Christian, at the least, in its beautiful spirit of resignation and life-long endurance. This lady writes too much and too hastily, and, alas! sometimes too affectedly; but with all this she *is* an artist, and an artist of a very superior order. Others might be named with Christian tendencies and aspirations; but we do not wish to prove too much, and should mention, as a set-off, the existence of such an authoress as the so-called "Currer Bell," as

a sample of a more mischievous class. Her "Jane Eyre" was emphatically a *bad* book, though a clever one (by no means *so* clever, however, as a certain class of criticlings proclaimed it!): her recent "Shirley" is at once dull and odious, though, of course, egregiously belauded and bepuffed: it is far worse than a mere negative failure.

But, to return at last from these digressions to our author and his new work,—"The Caxtons," we proclaim it, will live, and will be honoured long. Despite occasional affectation, despite some displays of morbid sentiment, despite the worst of all deficiencies, the absence of any true *conviction* in the writer's mind on the highest of all themes,—this *is* a creation of genius, picturesque, yet real and life-like, the rich fruit of its author's summertide, which will not soon wither or pass away. It professes to be the autobiography of a certain "Pisistratus Caxton," son of a poor gentleman and great scholar, who is moved by a certain wildness of his animal spirits, as well as by the want of "cash," to emigrate to Australia; whence he returns, after the absence of ten years, with a reasonable fortune, marries his pretty cousin Blanche, and so settles comfortably for life as a gentleman farmer. "Autobiography," did we say? No! that is not the right word: for we read less of Pisistratus himself than of others; his father Austin or Augustin, his high-spirited uncle Roland, his speculative uncle Jack, his sweet mother, and his mysterious cousin, Vivian, or Gower, or Herbert de Caxton, by whatever name we choose to greet him: and therefore this is in very truth that "Family Picture" which its author's title-page proclaims it; and the many passages therein redolent of home and its affections are the things which most endear it to our sympathies. The most prominent characteristic of this production, that which would first strike the general reader, is its obvious "setting in" for the humorous; that is, not the humour of Dickens, nor of Jerrold, but that of Rabelais, of Sterne, of Jean Paul, and more especially of Southey, whose "Doctor" we suspect Sir Edward of having read *very recently;* in fact, only just before entering on the execution of this book. Not that there is not much in Sir Edward's own heart and mind which would not take kindly to such learned banter and good-natured ridicule of the world and its follies. He does not quite stand on the intellectual height of the great bard of Keswick, who had so thorough and so earnest a contempt for the public. (Have our readers read the beautiful chapter in "The Doctor," which deals with this *grave* theme?) For truly we recognize Southey's mind, as one of the very noblest and loftiest ever possessed by a human being, and trust to do some justice to him in connexion with his interesting biography,

now publishing. But, though that distinctness of thought, whether for good or evil, right or wrong, common to all great poets, and more especially to be noted in Southey, is *not* Sir Edward's heritage, yet his knowledge of the world is real and extensive, far more practical than that of the bard of Keswick; and his learning, if not so profound, is scarcely less versatile, while his natural powers of humour, exemplified in this as well as in earlier works, do not place him far below the level of the author of "Queen Mary's Christening," and the exquisite "Queen Orraca and the Martyrs Five."

But, after all, though we *like* the humour of "The Caxtons," we are not quite sure what it does *there;* whether its presence can be satisfactorily accounted for. In many parts of this book Pisistratus, its author, and we suppose hero, is abundantly earnest and passionate, and quite forgets to emulate Rabelais: and we cannot but entertain doubts whether these strong affections, sometimes melodramatic in expression, assimilate very naturally with the humouristic strain, which is taken up again whenever the more violent emotions subside into temporary quietude. We suppose Sir Edward would tell us that Pisistratus has inherited much of the natural humour of his father; but then this should have been more clearly shown us in the course of the work: *there* he is rather made to talk like a pragmatical philosopher, whenever he takes any part in a discussion, than like a humourist. Certain it is, that no such union of passion and humour will be discovered in Rabelais, or Sterne, or Southey, or any other humouristic writer we know of, save and except Byron in his "Don Juan;" and that pre-eminently wicked book is obviously an exception to all rules, and plumes itself, as it were, on the transgression of them. This combination certainly strikes us as unreal; and yet we feel that from a certain point of view it may be defensible. Pisistratus is not represented as a genius. Why *should* he write "at first hand?" Why should he not, by an effort of the mind, throw himself into the attitude of a literary humourist, even if such attitude be not natural to him? He cannot help seeing his father's foibles. How natural that he should disguise them beneath this mask of kindly humours, or rather, that he should pitch his own tone in unison with that of his progenitor! But these arguments "pro" and "con," which might be extended "ad infinitum," are leading us wide of the mark; and we are bound to remember both the exigencies and the dignity of "the English Review."

Without further ramblings, then, let us to the work before us. It commences with a scene which recals most vividly the first in "Tristram Shandy;" and yet has, in some respects, more

affinity with that of Southey's charming "Doctor." It is free from the coarseness which is Sterne's chief bane, but not altogether free from vulgarity,—vulgarity most unnatural to Sir Edward, into which he has only been seduced by his resolution to be sternly humouristic. (This is not meant for a pun: Heaven forbid!) Such a phrase from the scholar and gentleman, Austin Caxton, as, "Why, my wife is *a precious woman!*" at once appeared unnatural to us, and seemed only the more so when we made the closer acquaintance of its speaker. It is the birth of "Pisistratus," the narrator, which is herein set forth; upon the whole, with no little spirit. The gentle mother, and the well-meaning but wrong-headed "Squills," the doctor, are adroitly placed before us, with a few touches. And so the scholar, Augustine (rather a bore he must have been! we should shudder to *know* such a man), soon displays his amiable qualities, and makes himself, more or less, agreeable to the reader. His winning of his wife is happily suggested: the christening too is not ill-treated, though, of course, in that light tone which indicates that our author is wanting in "conviction." The first family anecdote, however, which has much interest for us, is that of the broken flower-pot, which is simply and charmingly told, and which illustrates "the sanctity and the happiness of self-sacrifice." We refer our readers to the book for it. "Pisistratus" grows, and his intellectual growth is far too rapid: at eight years old he is a "Chinese man," a premature philosopher, and is very wisely packed off to school, where he soon gets rid of his loftier morbid imaginings. Our author writes most sensibly under this head (vol. i. p. 41). "The ordeal for talent is school: restore the stunted manikin to the growing child,—and *then* let the child, if it can, healthily, hardily, naturally, work its slow way up into greatness. If greatness be denied it, it will at least be a man, and that is better than to be a little Johnny Styles" (a child of genius) "all its life,—an oak in a pill-box." May all fond mothers and doting fathers act on this sound advice! Here ends the first book or part. Why this work should be divided into parts, we cannot precisely see; but Sir Edward likes the theatrical, likes to lower the curtain and draw it up again, and sometimes pop it up and down most unexpectedly: and such little stage starts are excusable enough, after all, *if* nature and truth are not sacrificed in their attainment. But we proceed. The school, with its German master, Dr. Hermann, is graphically suggested rather than pourtrayed, and some amusing matter occurs as to Greek names, which, according to Dr. Hermann, should be Greek indeed to the vulgar, even "Thoukudídes" and "Peisistratos." Then uncle Jack comes on the stage: and admi-

rably developed is this compound of humanity, and speculation, and selfishness, in which the latter quality most decidedly preponderates. His sister's admiration of him, for having robbed her of a doll for some charitable purpose, when they were both children, is highly humorous and life-like. "'So like him, so good!' she would often say pensively." (See p. 63.) Now, uncle Jack, having failed in his attempts on other people's pockets, has set his heart on making a "millionnaire," that is, a victim of Augustine Caxton, the scholar; and this after sundry efforts he accomplishes. But, for the present, he baits the hook in vain: the man of learning will not rise. A charming little anecdote occurs here, which we must needs appropriate to our pages. It is a passage in natural history. The Caxtons' comfortable country-house, on the outskirts of a village, has just been described; so has its garden. This garden has a walk, on which Austin "deambulates."

"In these deambulations, as he called them, he had generally a companion so extraordinary, that I expect to be met with a hillalu of incredulous contempt when I specify it. Nevertheless, I vow and protest that it is strictly true, and no invention of an exaggerating romance. It happened one day that my mother had coaxed Mr. Caxton to walk with her to market. By the way they passed a sward of green, on which sundry little boys were engaged upon the lapidation or stoning of a lame duck. It seemed that the duck was to have been taken to market, when it was discovered not only to be lame, but dyspeptic: perhaps some weed had disagreed with its ganglionic apparatus, poor thing. However that be, the good wife had declared that the duck was good for nothing; and, upon the petition of her children, it had been consigned to them, for a little innocent amusement, and to keep them out of harm's way. My mother declared that she never saw her lord and master roused to such animation. He dispersed the urchins, released the duck, carried it home, kept it in a basket by the fire, fed it and physicked it till it recovered; and then it was consigned to the square pond. But, lo! the duck knew its benefactor; and, whenever my father appeared outside his door, it would catch sight of him, flap from the pond, gain the lawn, and hobble after him (for it never quite recovered the use of its left leg), till it reached the walk by the peaches; and then sometimes it would sit, gravely watching its master's deambulations; sometimes stroll by his side, and, at all events, never leave him till, at his return home, he fed it with his own hands; and, quacking her peaceful adieu, the nymph then retired to her natural element."

Is not this admirably told? How it would have delighted Southey's heart! It reminds us of Simrock's story of "The Dog of Bretten," which we have not space to narrate just at

present. Let us pass on. Uncle Jack's sayings and doings are all very humorously reported. A little political anecdote anent this worthy will not "come in" amiss, to vary our pages. A Tory Squire has attacked the existing state of things: Uncle Jack, always anxious to sympathize with the last speaker, chimes in, but without having the least notion whether Squire Rollick is a Tory or a Whig. Jack commences, then, by repeating the Squire's ejaculation:—

"'Not a county newspaper to advocate the rights of ————' Here my uncle stopped, as if at a loss, and whispered in my ear, 'What are his politics?' 'Don't know,' answered I. Uncle Jack intuitively took down from his memory the phrase most readily at hand, and added, with a nasal intonation, 'the rights of our distressed fellow-creatures!' My father scratched his eyebrow with his forefinger, as he was apt to do when doubtful: the rest of the company, a silent set, looked up. 'Fellow-creatures!' said Mr. Rollick, 'fellow-fiddlesticks!' Uncle John was clearly in the wrong box; he drew out of it cautiously: 'I mean,' said he, 'our *respectable* fellow-creatures!'"

The gist of the joke lies in this charming epithet, *respectable*, as here applied; but Sir Edward, or rather Pisistratus Caxton, carries on the sentence as though *he* did not see it.—Pisistratus is now home for the holidays; but soon he comes home to stay: and the passage on this subject is rather striking:—

"That is a very strange crisis in our life when we come home '*for good.*' Home seems a different thing. Before, one has been but a sort of guest after all, only welcomed and indulged, and little festivities held in honour of the released and happy child. But to come home *for good*, to have done with school and boyhood, is to be a guest, a child no more. It is to share the every-day life of cares and duties; it is to enter into the confidences of home. Is it not so? I could have buried my face in my hands and wept."

Setting aside the last line, which is a little, a very little, morbid, (for a fine youth might feel this, but would scarcely thus express himself,) the rest is very well said, and very true:—

"Homeward at last! O, rapturous pleasure!
Homeward at last our journey goes,
To where my father mourns his treasure,
To where our silent river flows!
* * * * *
Homewards? There's rapture in the word!"

We must not linger. Uncle Jack's speculation with the county paper we have passed by. "Pro Rege et Grege," is an

admirable motto for an agricultural organ, we aver in sober earnest,—we, who, like Sir Edward, are "Protectionists."

Make room for Uncle Roland! one of the best-drawn characters in the book,—the enthusiastic soldier, the Christian, the deeply-wronged father! Christian? And yet how should this agree with the very heterodox view of the origin of religion assigned to this worthy, on page 107? Surely, Sir Edward, setting aside the absurdity, and even wickedness, of the notion, you have forgotten all fitness, you have set aside all nature, here. This does not tally with the Captain's sentiments; but we cannot enter on a theological disquisition just now, though come it must, when we consider Austin's "Magnum Opus," the "History of Human Error." But we have various colloquies betwixt the brothers,—Squills, Pisistratus, and his gentle mother, being also interlocutors,—which have no little merit in their way. "My Uncle Roland's Tale," (page 140,) suggestive of his own sad fortunes with his only son, a runaway profligate, is very striking and graphic: the incident of "the Motto," which forms its epilogue, reminds us too closely of Uncle Toby and his fly. And yet, "perish they who have said our good things before us!" may Sir Edward ejaculate: "I should have written the same chapter, had no Sterne breathed this mortal air!" It may be so, Sir Edward; but, surely, this must remain a doubt,—a charitable doubt, at best.—The fourth part opens with a graphic passage on early rising. We quote it:—

"I was always an early riser. Happy the man who is! Every morning a day comes to him with a virgin's love, full of bloom and purity and freshness. The youth of nature is contagious, like the gladness of a happy child. I doubt if any man can be called 'old,' so long as he is an early riser, and an early *walker*. And oh, youth!—take my word for it,—youth in dressing-gown and slippers, dawdling over breakfast at noon, is a very decrepid, ghastly image of that youth, which sees the sun blush over the mountains, and the dews sparkle upon blossoming hedgerows."

There is a pertness almost bordering on vulgarity in Pisistratus's share in the ensuing colloquy: we cannot approve of it. And now we have arrived at the so-called great work, the life's production of the scholar; and a very useless production it would seem to be,—a ramblification through all climes and ages to arrive at no result whatever, a history of all errors, without one positive word anent truth,—in fact, a mere negative protest, a child still-born, a piece of learned lumber. We wonder Sir Edward does not see this; but he is apt to confound the means with the end, and so to rest in the former. Hence his intense

admiration of mere scholarship, as scholarship. But he may tell us *he* does see all this; that it is only the son, Pisistratus, who is blinded by his filial affection: if so, we cannot accept this explanation; for Austin Caxton is the "Deus ex machina" of the book; his is admitted, on all hands, to be "the master-mind." He reforms the otherwise incorrigible Vivian, Uncle Roland's truant son; to him, too, the statesman Trevanion bows down; by him Lady Ellinor, herself depicted as so great, is guided and metamorphosed. So we are certainly *expected* to look upon Austin Caxton as a very wise man indeed, while to us he appears a very silly one. We have no patience with your circular reasoners, your endless talkifiers, your intellectual windmills, your "Hamlets,"—in one word, fellows who want the faculty of putting two and two together, and who would always hold it unphilosophical and gratuitous to assume that the said two and two made four. Yet these are the gods of Sir Edward's idolatry. He has too much of this German element himself; but, surely, he should know this, and strive to cast it out, not put it on a pedestal for worship. Such minds are to be found among the followers of various parties: we need scarcely say that *ultra*-high churchmen are often this way inclined, who accept any thing because they believe nothing! This total absence of positive core, or bearing, is most conspicuous in Austin Caxton's "Great Achievement." It is just "a big talk," as the Indians say, and "there's an end." But not so thinks Sir Edward. "It was the moral history of mankind, told with truth and earnestness, yet with an arch unmalignant smile." Pooh! bother! Our dignity as reviewers is at war with our wholesome indignation. In the next sentence we are informed quite coolly (page 161) that he, the sage, "viewed man first in the savage state, preferring in this the positive accounts of voyagers and travellers, to the vague myths of antiquity, and the dreams of speculators on the pristine state." Very pretty, indeed! The "vague myths," and "the dreams;" and this is said of God's Word, which Sir Edward, in the person of "Pisistratus Caxton," professes to reverence so very highly. We are ready to believe that Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton never considered the consequences of his truly insolent assumption; but this we can tell him,—because we have thought upon the subject, if he has not,—that the Old Testament and the New tally so marvellously, as to drive every rational man to the conclusion, that that agreement must proceed from fraud and forgery, or otherwise be the inevitable result of the internal unity of all the parts of Revelation: and we can further assure him, that this latter conclusion will be forced upon every impartial inquirer, with a force which will admit of no cavil or shadow of a

doubt. To illustrate this here would be a work of supererogation. We may refer, Sir Edward, however, to a fine article in the last number of "The Edinburgh," for some striking observations on the subject, though the case of Christianity is there much understated, owing, in all probability, to the imperfect orthodoxy of its writer; and we may perhaps be allowed to remind him, that the germ of that prophecy, which was finally fulfilled in the coming of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, (to whom we offer our unfeigned worship,) is to be found in that very so-called "myth," which he dismisses so contemptuously. So much, too, let us add! The further science spreads her researches, the more evidences do we obtain of a *common origin* for man. We had thought that no well-informed thinker would venture to dispute, that, from the evidences of the past, and their own records, all the savages in the world are in a state of decadence and decay,—are slips from the common stock of humanity, who have been transplanted from the centre of civilization. Here then lies a gross and fundamental error at the root of all the researches of the learned Mr. Caxton. Such learning is "foolishness" indeed; but let us waste no more words upon the subject. There is a pretty image, though a very false one, at the end of this chapter, lauding this very sorry "Magnum Opus." Pisistratus is supposed to wish his father had been a novelist. "Ah!" he says, "what a writer of romances he would have been, if—if what?—if he had had as sad an experience of men's passions, as he had the happy intuition into their humours. But he who would see the mirror of the shore, must look where it is cast on *the river*, not *the ocean*. The narrow stream reflects the gnarled tree, and the panting herd, and the village spire, and the romance of the landscape. But the sea reflects only the vast outline of the headland, and the lights of the eternal heaven!" That is to say, the man of contemplation, the essayist, is infinitely greater, than the man of creative genius. As the sea is to the stream, so is Bacon or Shaftesbury to Shakspeare! Truly, a monstrous assertion! Cannot the sea reflect a rocky giant coast far, far into its bosom? Has Sir Edward never travelled from Nice to Genoa, or even overlooked the cliffs of Devonshire? Creative artists, we may add, when they paint passions, do this from intuition, not experience. Think you Shakspeare's daughters must have "torn his heart out," before he could paint "King Lear?" The same intuition conceived that royal madman, and the Ariel of the Tempest. The essayist, indeed, the thinker at second hand, may be likened to the stream, which takes the line of the banks past which it glides. Creative genius is expansive as the ocean, has its calms, and its tempests; and mirrors,—mark

it, Sir Edward!—the polestar of faith, which *may* never shine upon the little river. But to proceed. To promote the publication of this work, the family go up to town. Pisistratus travels thither on foot, and, on his way, falls in with the Trevanions, old friends of his father's. Mr. Trevanion himself was the fellow-collegian of Austin; Lady Ellinor was his first-love: both are admirably described. Mr. Trevanion is, in our opinion, a type of Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, in more than one respect. Thus we read of him (page 212): "As a speaker, he wants the fire and enthusiasm which engage the popular sympathies. He never embraces any party heartily; he never espouses any question as if wholly in earnest. The moderation with which he is said to pique himself, often exhibits itself in fastidious crotchets, and an attempt at philosophical originality of candour, which has long obtained him with his enemies the reputation of a trimmer." And again, he is made to say himself (page 250), "Come, I will tell you the one secret of my public life,—that which explains all its failure (for, in spite of my position, I have failed) and its regrets,—*I want conviction!*" One cannot help suspecting that Sir Edward had an eye to his own case, when he penned these lines. At page 269 of vol. iii., this shilly-shally undecided character of mind is further developed in Trevanion, pushed even to the ludicrous; and yet we fear Sir Edward secretly admires it all the while. Trevanion's daughter, Fanny, is rather indicated, than painted; but the indication is admirably given. But Lady Ellinor's portrait is more finished, and we must extract it:—

"With curious interest, and a survey I strove to make impartial, I compared Lady Ellinor with my mother; and I comprehended the fascination which the highborn lady must, in her earlier youth, have exercised upon both brothers (Roland and Austin), so dissimilar to each other; for, *charm* was the characteristic of Lady Ellinor,—a charm indefinable. It was not the mere grace of refined breeding, though that went a great way: it was a charm that seemed to spring from *natural sympathy*. Whomsoever she addressed, that person appeared, for the moment, to engage all her attention, to interest her whole mind. She had a gift of conversation very peculiar; she made what she said like a continuation of what was said to her; she seemed as if she had entered into your thoughts, and talked them aloud. Her mind was evidently cultivated with great care, but she was perfectly void of pedantry. A hint, an allusion, sufficed to show how much she knew, to one well instructed, without mortifying or perplexing the ignorant. Yes, there probably was the only woman my father had ever met, who could be the companion to his mind, walk through the garden of knowledge by his side, and trim the flowers, while he cleared the vistas."

Setting aside the very exaggerated compliment to Austin Caxton, whose mind seems to have been a mere vast lumber-room, whose exhaustless memory was his only valuable faculty, —what a portrait have we here, one worthy of the first of literary portrait-painters! Ah! Sir Edward, if to that gift of observation you added, but in a minor degree, that of generalization, *then* you would be *a great man* indeed! But we must take things as they are; not as we should wish them: even now you are *a great novelist*, and that is saying much.—But we must pass on hastily. Pisistratus comes to town at last, having further fallen in with the scapegrace Vivian on the way, into whose adventures we cannot enter: subsequently, he becomes Trevanion's secretary, and falls in love with his daughter Fanny. When he finds this out,—Pisistratus, we mean,—he is conscience-stricken, and finally resolves to put himself out of harm's way by leaving the house. The love of his parents in some degree consoles him. Our author says very beautifully (vol. ii. p. 99);—"How much we have before us in life, while we retain our parents! How much to strive and to hope for! What a motive in the conquest of our sorrow, that *they* may not sorrow with us!" There is much good matter about Captain Roland's sufferings and "Robert Hall." The Captain, indeed, is the most religious character in the book, and says nothing offensive, if we except the one unhappy slip, already noticed, respecting the origin of religion. But now a great crisis is approaching. Pisistratus goes to college, and, meanwhile, Uncle Jack lugs Austin Caxton by the mental ear of his vanity, into a most ruinous speculation. Pisistratus returns in alarm, and a final arrangement is entered into, by which 8000*l.* are saved. Then, finally, Austin and his establishment locate themselves with Uncle Roland in the family tower in Cumberland. Here Pisistratus vegetates for some time, but at last naturally grows impatient, and writes a very striking letter to Trevanion, asking him whether he should not emigrate. This letter, depicting as it does the strong necessity felt by a class of our rising youth, for some active sphere of energy, with space to move in, is referred to by Sir Edward himself, as one of the main points of interest in his work. We cannot find space for it: but our readers may conceive how those, who would have been mailed knights and squires of old, cannot now bind them to the ledger, cannot now toil over books for life, and yet may not have "the needful" for army or for navy. What then is left? Emigration! Trevanion of course coincides with his young friend, and finally our hero starts, having, by various means, won over his uncle Roland, his father, and his mother, to the project. But first he achieves great things: he rescues Fanny Trevanion from an auda-

cious adventurer, who had succeeded in carrying her off towards Gretna Green, and this adventurer proves to be "Herbert de Caxton," Uncle Roland's son, previously reclaimed from infamy by the exertions of our Pisistratus. But Fanny is not to be our hero's after all: no, her hand is won by the delightful Sir Sedley Beaudesert, alias the Earl of Castleton, with 100,000*l.* a year, the very "beau ideal" of all ladies' men,—amiable to an excess, refined and yet manly, forty-seven years of age, and still an Adonis! A very admirable sketch is "Sir Sedley Beaudesert:" drawn too, we should say, despite its strangeness, from the life. And a very happy pair are he and Lady Castleton—"née" Fanny Trevanion, and admirably are they depicted towards the close of the third volume. But first, and before Pisistratus starts for Sidney, Uncle Roland's son is to be reformed, and this wonder is effected mainly by the marvellous eloquence of Austin Caxton. "Credat Judæus!" say we. It is evident enough that the fiery "Vivian" would have thought this worthy Austin both a twaddle and a bore. But, pass we that,—and cross we the wide ocean to Australia, which is graphically brought before us in its wild bush-life. The description of the Australian night (p. 211) is high poetry. "Guy Bolding," who finds every thing disagreeable "such fun," is capitally drawn. His spirits have been the ruin of him in England, but he finds a vent for them in the new world, learns even to prize books from being so long without them, and finally marries and settles down most comfortably in "the Bush." Meanwhile Pisistratus, who, as we said before, has made "a sufficiency," returns, getting first some three or four thousands back from Uncle Jack, who has actually picked up a fortune in Australia. Well, he comes home, sees his cousin Blanche, who has grown tall and beautiful meanwhile, and rejoices his parents' and his uncle's hearts, by marrying her. That uncle's *son* had left Australia (whither he first accompanied Pisistratus,) and had entered the Indian service, in which he at last fell, covered with glory, and, in thus far, redeeming the past.

Such is the general course of the narrative before us, but we must return again for some characteristic extract or extracts wherewith to do fuller justice to our theme. One passage, though very long for our pages, we consider so masterly, as to be unable to deprive ourselves of the pleasure of transcribing it. It occurs after the crash of ruin in the second volume. The family are gathered together, Uncle Roland and Squills being present, and have just agreed to break up the establishment, to abandon their beloved household gods, when "Uncle Jack," the cause of all this ruin, is announced. We must not omit to add, that he had taken Austin in most thoroughly, and squandered all his money, with-

out his knowing any thing about it. He has further involved himself, rather made himself responsible, for he *had* nothing to begin with, and so he has been incarcerated in "the Fleet" some little while, but soon set free by the exceeding liberality of Mr. Caxton. However, he is presumed to be most penitent, and is not expected to show his face for years. Having said thus much, we may proceed to the extract.

"Mr. Squills was about to reply, when ring-a ting-ring-ting! there came such a brisk, impatient, make-one's-self-at-home kind of tintinnabular alarum at the great gate, that we all started up and looked at each other in surprise. Who could it possibly be? We were not kept long in suspense; for in another moment Uncle Jack's voice, which was always very clear and distinct, pealed through the hall; and we were still staring at each other when Mr. Tibbets" (that is his name) "with a bran new muffler round his neck, and a peculiarly comfortable great-coat, best double Saxony, equally new, dashes into the room, bringing with him a considerable quantity of cold air, which he hastened to thaw, first in my father's arms, next in my mother's. He then made a rush at the Captain (Uncle Roland), who ensconced himself behind the dumb, waiter with a 'Hem! Mr.—Sir—Jack—Sir—hem, hem!'—Failing there, Mr. Tibbets rubbed off the remaining frost upon his double Saxony against your humble servant; patted Squills affectionately on the back, and then proceeded to occupy his favourite position before the fire. 'Took you by surprise, eh?' said Uncle Jack, unpeeling himself by the hearth-rug. 'But no, not by surprise; you must have known Jack's heart: you at least, Austin Caxton, who know every thing—you must have seen that it overflowed with the tenderest and most brotherly emotions; that once delivered from that cursed Fleet, (you have no idea what a place it is, Sir,) I could not rest, night or day, till I had flown, here,—here, to the dear family nest—poor wounded dove that I am!' added Uncle Jack, pathetically, and taking out his pocket-handkerchief from the double Saxony, which he had now flung over my father's arm-chair. Not a word replied to this eloquent address, with its touching peroration. My mother hung down her pretty head, and looked ashamed. My uncle retreated quite into the corner, and drew the dumb-waiter after him, so as to establish a complete fortification. Mr. Squills seized the pen that Roland had thrown down, and began mending it furiously, that is, cutting it into slivers, thereby denoting, symbolically, how he would like to do with Uncle Jack, could he once get him safe and snug under his manipular operations. I bent over the pedigree, and my father rubbed his spectacles. The silence would have been appalling to another man: nothing appalled Uncle Jack. Uncle Jack turned to the fire, and warmed first one foot, then the other. This comfortable ceremony performed, he again faced the company, and resumed, musingly, and as if answering some imaginary observations, 'Yes, yes, you are right there, and a deuced unlucky speculation it proved too. But I was overruled by that fellow Peck. Says I to

him, says I,' '*Capitalist!*' (the name of the ruinous publication started) 'Pshaw, no popular interest there, it don't address the great public! Very confined class the capitalists; better throw ourselves boldly on the people. Yes,' said I, 'call it the *Anti*-Capitalist. By Jove, sir, we should have carried all before us; but I was overruled. The *Anti-Capitalist!* What an idea! Address the whole reading-world there, Sir: everybody hates the Capitalist—everybody would have his neighbour's money. The *Anti-Capitalist!* Sir, we should have gone off, in the manufacturing towns, like wildfire. But what could I do?'—'John Tibbets,' said my father solemnly, 'capitalist or anti-capitalist, thou hadst a right to follow thine own bent in either, but always provided it had been with thine own money. Thou seest not the thing, John Tibbets, in the right point of view; and a little repentance in the face of those thou hast wronged, would not have misbecome thy father's son, and thy sister's brother.' Never had so severe a rebuke issued from the mild lips of Austin Caxton; and I raised my eyes with a compassionate thrill, expecting to see Jack Tibbets gradually sink and disappear through the carpet. 'Repentance!' cried Uncle Jack, bounding up, as if he had been shot. 'And do you think I have a heart of stone, of pummy-stone! Do you think I don't repent? I have done nothing but repent; I shall repent to my dying day.' 'Then there is no more to be said, Jack,' cried my father, softening and holding out his hand. 'Yes,' cried Mr. Tibbets, seizing the hand, and pressing it to the heart he had thus defended from the suspicion of being pummy; 'yes, that I should have trusted that dunderheaded, rascally curmudgeon, Peck; that I should have let him call it *The Capitalist*, despite all my convictions, when the *Anti*—' 'Pshaw!' interrupted my father, drawing away his hand. 'John,' said my mother, gravely, and with tears in her voice, 'you forget who delivered you from prison,—you forget whom you have nearly consigned to prison yourself,—you forg—,' 'Hush, hush!' said my father, 'this will never do; and it is you who forget, my dear, the obligations I owe to Jack. He has reduced my fortune one half, it is true, but I verily think he has made the three hearts, in which lie my real treasures, twice as large as they were before. Pisistratus, my boy, ring the bell.'—'My dear Kitty,' cried Jack, whimperingly, and stealing up to my mother, 'don't be so hard on me; I thought to make all your fortunes—I did, indeed.'—Here the servant entered.—'See that Mr. Tibbets' things are taken up to his room, and that there is a good fire,' said my father.—'And,' continued Jack, loftily, 'I *will* make all your fortunes yet. I have it *here!*' and he struck his head.—'Stay a moment!' said my father to the servant, who had got back to the door. 'Stay a moment,' said my father, looking extremely frightened; 'perhaps Mr. Tibbets may prefer the inn!'—'Austin,' said Uncle Jack with emotion, 'if I were a dog, with no home but a dog-kennel, and you came to me for shelter, I would turn out, to give you the best of the straw!'—My father was thoroughly melted this time.—'Primmins will be sure to see that every thing is made comfortable for Mr. Tibbets,' said he, waving his hand to the servant. 'Something nice for supper, Kitty, my dear—

and the largest punch-bowl. You like punch, Jack?'—'Punch, Austin?' said Uncle Jack, putting his handkerchief to his eyes.—The Captain pushed aside the dumb-waiter, strode across the room, and shook hands with Uncle Jack; my mother buried her face in her apron, and fairly ran off; and Squills said in my ear, 'It all comes of the biliary secretions. Nobody could account for this, who did not know the peculiarly fine organization of your father's liver.'"

This we affirm to be a very masterpiece. Which of our readers doubts it? Surely, we need not point out the consummate delicacy and tact, the refined humour, the thorough knowledge of human character, here displayed. Every word tells. Every epithet has the happiness of genius. We pity him who cannot "chuckle" quietly, but delightedly, over the various incidents which form this wondrous whole. We question whether "Tristram Shandy" contains any thing equal to it.

This one extract has occupied so much space that we are compelled to omit others we had marked for quotation: the admirable account of Sir Sedley Beaudesert's miseries in finding himself Earl of Castleton, and master of 100,000*l.* a year,—one or two Australian scenes,—a humorous passage about a sixpence, and various sayings which pleased our fancy, or touched our feelings, must be left in their native sphere by us.—But, thus omitting to quote beauties, we must be very hasty, on the other hand, in the record of those censures which might have otherwise dilated beneath our pen. We *did* mean to suggest, that Sir Edward's humour, though generally most refined, does here and there seem to us,—and yet the expression is strong,—we were about to say,—does seem to border on *silliness;* but the fault may be in our want of appreciation. We could instance certain talk on p. 19, vol. i.; the passages, or some of them, introduced by Austin Caxton's "putting his hand into his waistcoat," the amount of learning anent the "Antanaclasis and Epiphonema," which seems to us a little out of place, displayed, vol. ii. p. 283, even the rather studied break in the narration (vol. ii. p. 33), concluding with "the end of the chapter." Then, too, sundry *affectations* should be adverted to: excess of sobbing and weeping in various places, and a certain priggish sententiousness, which shows itself in the speeches of Pisistratus, as in vol. ii. pp. 49. 53, &c. There is an occasional tendency, too, to "bigmouthedness," where there is really little to be said, as in the grandiloquent passage, vol. ii. p. 194, on "Silence:" but this error of judgment in Sir Edward's utterances is much less frequent than of yore. Then, too, there are the little stage trickeries already noticed: the last word, too, in many a chapter is forced and stagey, to avoid an anticlimax. But we can understand Sir

Edward's failing on this point very well: his style seems to render this little device unavoidable, occasionally. Of course, the worst point about this very clever book is its *religious indifference*, or fashionable pantheism, or whatever our author himself would be pleased to call it. Man's *nature*, with him, is divine. If we can but awake that, all must be well. We need scarcely say, that this is a very partial and a very incorrect view; that man's nature is compounded of good and evil; and that evil, for the more part, has a decided preponderance, wherever religion does not exert her influence. But religion is virtually ignored in this book; a clergyman is *once* mentioned, and only once, in a half line: one might suppose that the Church and Christianity were dead letters. True, there are one or two pathetic passages about the Bible; but then what do they *mean?* No one can tell. True, there is a fine passage (vol. ii. p. 41) about that SOMETHING, that immortal spirit, without which our best-beloved fellow-creature is but a clod of clay. But this, and more than this, forms but a slight "set off" against the downright infidel philosophy promulgated, as to the origin of man and of religion, and what we may call "the ignoring," throughout, of Christianity, as a vital element, nay, as *the* life itself, something beyond a sentiment, and a memory.

Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton has, then, much to learn, and to unlearn, before we can hail him as a fellow-workman in the cause of humanity. We admit that a man may serve God by action as well as prayer; we admit that an author may serve Christianity indirectly as well as directly. We admit, too, that in a Christian land, and under the omnipresent influence of Christianity, many of its fruits are ofttimes displayed by those who are not really Christians; even such men as "Sir Sedley Beaudesert." If not the rose (to recal the old and hackneyed Eastern simile), *they* have lived near it. Nevertheless truth remains truth. The Redeemer was what He proclaimed Himself, God suffering for humanity, or He was, what our pen would shrink from tracing. This is a central verity. He who neglects it, neglects it to his eternal peril. He who receives it, must realize it in all he does, or says, or creates. This is our last word for the present with Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton.

ART. V.—*A Pilgrimage to Rome. By the Rev.* M. HOBART SEYMOUR, *M.A.* London: Seeleys.

THE motives which influence many men in their choice of religion will scarcely bear the analysis of sober reasoning. To some persons the æsthetics of Christianity constitute almost its sole claim on their acceptance. The romance and mystery of certain parts and portions of religion, whether true or false, are a potent charm to minds of a certain constitution; and it is difficult to say what amount of effect is producible on such minds by skilfully appealing to their predominant sensibilities. Without doubt a great influence has been exercised over persons both within and without the communion of the Church of Rome, by the representation of profound self-denial, monastic austerities, continual habits of devotion, and other impressive features. The church continually open for prayer, and exhibiting its silent worshippers, the daily celebration of mass, the resignation of the world's gaieties and splendours by the self-devoted virgin,—all these are fraught with matter for the romantic, the enthusiastic, the pious, and the credulous; and all the other side of the picture being kept out of sight, and studiously concealed, the most favourable impressions are made.

Yet, after all, those who have been in actual contact with Romanism, and are not merely acquainted with it in books, are fully aware that there *is* a very different view of the case; and many a man has been cured of all his tendencies to Romanism by witnessing with his own eyes the actual state of things—by descending from the regions of romance and imagination to those of common sense and fact.

Mr. Seymour, in the work before us, has supplied a real desideratum in our literature, by presenting to us a minute and accurate survey of the actual state of things in the Church of Rome. He details to us the results of his own experience. Without doubt his book will be differently viewed by different parties; but we have here a series of facts accredited by the author's name, and which bear along with them the evidences of a candid and a conscientious investigation. We deem these facts of so much importance, that although we doubt not that many of our readers are already familiar with the volume, we feel it a duty

to draw attention to the volume as one which, though not without some slight blemishes, is calculated to be of high utility in the present times.

We have long felt the extreme desirableness of such a work as Mr. Seymour has here accomplished; and we know not where to look for such a work: for, though travellers have frequently collected valuable information, yet it was generally cursorily introduced, or little authenticated, and liable to be forgotten: we wanted a traveller who should make it the especial object of his research to represent the Church of Rome *as it actually is*, and not as it is imagined by some of those who have never been eye-witnesses of its proceedings. The value of this work consists in its minute and graphic details on all these points, which are of special importance and interest in the present day.

While, however, we admit, to the fullest degree, the merits of this work, we must note one or two points in which we think the author has not exhibited his usual discretion. In some places we think that insinuations are made in reference to the practice of *immoralities* in monasteries, which may indeed be well founded, but which are not supported by evidence, and which therefore will be only set down to uncharitableness and prejudice. On another subject, too, we have to express some difference of view from Mr. Seymour.

In the account of his visit to Milan cathedral, he is led to observe that it is the pride and boast of the city, and is regarded amongst the inhabitants chiefly in the light of the greatest ornament of the city; "but," he goes on to remark,—

> "It is seldom viewed by them simply in reference to that God to whom it is dedicated, or to that Church for whose services it is designed. Its chief use seems to be that of ornament; its secondary use, that of religion: and, accordingly, it is but poorly attended; and many churches, of not one-tenth of its magnitude, have a far larger attendance of the inhabitants for worship. I visited it many times, both on Sunday and on other days, and was surprised at the fewness of the attendants, the more especially as one of their popular preachers was there on Sunday, when the whole of his congregation did not exceed one hundred and twenty persons."—p. 54.

The same appears to be generally the case all over the continent, as far as cathedrals are concerned: and this is an interesting fact, as bearing on the precisely similar case of our own cathedrals. It appears from Mr. Seymour's work, that the cathedrals are in general on the continent just as badly attended as our own; and the reason is the same in both cases. Mr. Seymour shall here speak for himself:—

"There is a great gulf between the original intention, and the modern application of the cathedral system.

"The original of the system was the bishop or head missionary planting his church as the central or principal station for missionary labour,—a station from which his missionaries might issue in every direction to propagate the Gospel of Christ. When any missionary had succeeded in his labour of love, and a number of converts had embraced the faith, then a congregation was formed, and a church erected in that locality, and the missionary, or some other, at the discretion of the bishop, was there placed, and became the local or parochial clergyman. In this manner he sent his band of missionaries, and planted his churches; his own church, as the central station, being the church for the converts of that locality (though afterwards called the cathedral church, from being the seat of the bishop), was the church of the locality where he resided; so as that originally a cathedral church differed in no respect whatever from any other parochial church, being for the same uses, and having the same services, with the alone exception that it belonged to the station, or district, or parish, in which the bishop resided: and, at the same time, the clergy who were with him were his fellow-labourers in the missionary work, and his fellow-counsellors and advisers in all circumstances connected with the exercise of his authority in the work of the mission, very much as is the case in the present day, when all give counsel and assistance to the principal missionary of the missionary settlement."

We believe this statement to be perfectly correct. It represents the discipline of the Church as it existed for several centuries; and this, subsequently, developed into the various forms which Mr. Seymour proceeds to describe, but not, we think, exactly in the chronological order he assigns to them. For more than a thousand years the cathedrals continued to be parish churches, the bishops, presbyters, and deacons being engaged in their respective duties in regard to the district attached to the cathedral. The bishop alone administered baptism, confirmation, the holy eucharist, and preached. The presbyters, archdeacon, and deacons assisted him in divine service, in visiting the sick, in ministering the alms, in instructing candidates for baptism, in the administration of penance and absolution, and generally in the whole affairs of the diocese, according as he had need of them. The presbyters, deacons, and principal laity chose their own bishop on the vacancy of the see, in accordance with the neighbouring bishops and metropolitan. We must now quote a passage from Mr. Seymour:—

"In times still later, a further change passed in some countries over the system. It was now the time when wealth and honours flowed in a broad stream into the Church, and made an entrance for the evil spirits

of ambition, covetousness, and self-seeking; they came in wafted upon the surface of the broad current . . . . there was 'ample space and verge enough' for providing well for the staff or band of clergymen around the bishop. New offices were created, and canons for the cathedral, and prebendaries for the cathedral, and readers for the cathedral, and choristers for the cathedral, were called into existence, and there were ample endowments for all. The bishop, appointing them of his own motion, and regarding them as his own creatures, could not look on himself—at least, could scarcely look on himself—as called on in any degree to regard them as his fellow-counsellors or advisers: and thus, as they had ceased to be regarded as missionaries in the natural course of things, so these cathedral clergy soon ceased to be treated as fellow-counsellors, and thus sunk into the unenviable and unchristian state, of mere creatures of the bishop, and drones in the Church."—pp. 56, 57.

We are of opinion that the above passage is somewhat inaccurately expressed. The chief difference, as it appears to us, between the original system, and the system of canons and prebendaries, being, that the cathedral body under the latter system was brought into a more monastic form than under the earlier system. The canons or prebendaries were the presbyters subjected to a certain monastic rule. But we are not aware that any addition was made to the cathedral bodies of clergy at this period, or that their wealth was much augmented from what it had been when they were under the former system. There was no intention whatever on the part of the regulators of the cathedral system who founded chapters of canons, or remodelled the old polity into that shape, that their canons or prebendaries should be wealthily endowed. They were, in fact, supported originally from the common fund of the Church; and it was only gradually that they were allotted distinct revenues, which made their places so many benefices, instead of offices. This division of the funds of the cathedral was probably contemporaneous with another and most important change to which Mr. Seymour refers subsequently:—we allude to the erection of *parish churches* in cathedral cities. It was this that really and truly left the canons without duties; they were divested of the cure of souls: their offices became sinecures; and, having nothing more to do, the greater part of their body, when there was a large number of canons, became *non-residentiary*, that is, were released from residence at the cathedral, and engaged in the care of remote parishes, or in other occupations. Plurality of benefices arose with non-residence; and it subsequently extended even to the *residentiary* canons, who were permitted to leave the cathedral to the care of one or two of their body in succession, while they

held benefices elsewhere, and resided for a few weeks in each year at the cathedral, or perhaps not at all, as the case might be. The appointment of minor canons, on whom the performance of divine service was devolved, and who were a species of curates under the canons, enabled this system of non-residence to be carried out. Divine service could thus be conducted without the presence of any of the canons.

Now all this arose, as we conceive, from the fatal alteration in ecclesiastical discipline, which divested the canons of cathedrals of those duties which they had always previously been subject to,—we mean, THE CURE OF SOULS. The moment that churches in cathedral cities were founded in such numbers, that all the people were placed under the charge of clergy of their own, the cathedral clergy were ousted of their most important duties, were placed in a false position, and thenceforward became only proverbial for sloth, self-indulgence, or avarice. Such was the state of things at the Reformation; and at that period the only alteration made in the system, consisting in the abolition of the offices for the hours of prayer, and of a vast number of other rites and ceremonies, left the canons even less to do than they had before. And thus it has continued ever since without alteration as a system, the only change effected being that of 1840, by which all the non-residentiary canonries were deprived of their incomes, and the number of residentiaries diminished; but there was no attempt to give substantial duties involving residence to those who were left.

We must here again refer to Mr. Seymour, though we do so with pain, and cannot concur in several of the expressions he employs. In the first part of the following remarks, however, every Churchman must cordially concur. In reference to the cathedrals, as existing at the period of the Reformation, he observes:—

"The splendid fabrics being already in existence, and large and ample endowments being already provided, the great question was, how they ought to have been disposed of. To destroy those magnificent structures would have been an act of Vandalism, almost without parallel in the history of the world; and to suffer them to fall to decay and ruin would have been as terrible a barbarism, deserving the worst execration of posterity. And yet their continuance in this their then state, and for their then uses, was utterly inconsistent with the religious spirit of the Reformation.

"It can never be too much lamented that there was no adequate reformation of the cathedral system; and that through the lapse of 300 years, the bishops of the Church of England had never proposed either to convocation, in the age of convocations, or to parliament, in this age

of parliaments, to make the cathedral system useful to the Church and subsidiary to the advancement of the true religion established among us. But that, on the other hand, they have continued and perpetuated the former state of things, only in a more effete and useless state, eagerly exercising their right of patronage in the appointment of the cathedral clergy and appropriation of the cathedral endowments, but making no efforts to render them subsidiary to the real wants of the Church, or assistants to the true interests of religion."—pp. 59, 60.

There is but too much truth in this very severe passage. Such neglect as is here referred to evinces, unquestionably, a want of zeal and energy to grapple with great and undeniable evils. But, then, it must be remembered that the fallen condition of the cathedral system was not the only evil, or even the greatest that had to be contended with. The general decay of ecclesiastical discipline was a still greater evil—the abuses of ecclesiastical courts, or of the whole system of corrective discipline—the utter cessation of the system of episcopal visitation; these were things that were of still more importance than cathedral reform, and yet they were not accomplished.

But, with reference to this latter question, we think, that Mr. Seymour should have reminded his readers, that the bishops alone were not responsible for the continuance of the abuses of the sinecure system in cathedrals. It should be remembered, that the crown possesses the patronage of all the deaneries, and one half of the canonries; and there is, at least, a fair degree of probability, that the crown would not have wished any interference with a system which placed at its disposal so many pieces of preferment for the accommodation of its adherents and favourites. Still we do not remember to have read that the attempt was ever made by our episcopate to reform the cathedral system; and in this we must admit that there was a very lamentable mistake, which will perhaps issue in the destruction of the whole system, with its good points as well as its bad.

The following remarks are deserving of attention:—

"There were three courses, any one of which might have been pursued with real profit to the Church of England, and the advancement of true religion.

"1. They might have adopted the collegiate system, appointing professors instead of canons . . . If the bishops, acting on their own authority, or applying to parliament for the requisite power, had converted the residences of the cathedral clergy into cathedral colleges, so as to secure a sound theological education for them who were to be prepared for the ministry of the Church—if they had appropriated the endowments now wasted upon the cathedral clergy, to the maintenance of such colleges and schools, such professors and teachers, as could

effectuate all this, then, indeed, they would have accomplished much for the best interests of the Church of England.

"2. Or they might have made another arrangement, which was always, and still is, in their power, and might at any moment be carried into effect. They might confer those cathedral appointments solely upon learned men—upon studious men, who desired to be separated from all parochial occupations, so as to devote themselves uninterruptedly to study. They might thus provide for men who were desirous of the time and opportunity for study, and who should be precluded from holding any other species of preferment, as that would defeat the very object in view. If the bishops had done this, or even attempted to do this, or would even now, at this the eleventh hour of the Church, begin to do this, the Church of England would reap a noble harvest from such encouragement to learning.

"3. Or yet, again, they might have pursued a third course. If they had desired some arrangement by which, always retaining the cathedral clergy as a sort of clerical staff around them, who, like the staff officers of the army, or the assistant missionaries of a missionary station, might be sent to any direction or to any work that might be required in the exigencies of the times,—if new churches were built in poor districts, where there are no maintenance or endowments,—if any parochial clergyman, from ill health or other causes, were compelled to be absent one or more weeks from his charge, then the members of this clerical staff—these cathedral clergy could be sent to supply his place; if the bishops of the Church of England had done this, then they would have done that which would have been found an incalculable convenience and assistance to the clergy, and a great advantage to the Church.

"The bishops have not adopted any of these courses; they have continued the mediæval system without mitigation."—pp. 60, 61.

There is much in this which every friend of the Church of England must approve of. It has been invariably the effort of all advocates of cathedral establishments to point out the utility of their endowments in maintaining a learned and studious clergy. Without doubt, learned men have been, from time to time, possessed of cathedral preferments. As, however, they have held them with parochial preferments, their canonries have not given them any "learned leisure." It would have been well, had the suggestions of many persons in the Church been attended to, and the canonries been attached to professorships in diocesan theological colleges, or other offices with onerous duties. All suggestions, however, for improvement in the cathedral system have been made in vain; they have been wholly set aside. Mr. Seymour observes, that,

"It is often stated in apology for the bishops, that, however desirable such a measure might be, and however desirous they might

be to accomplish it, they have not the requisite authority—they have not the power.

"Have the bishops exhibited any such desire, by applying to the legislature for such power?

"I answer, No.

"The bishops have not exercised the inherent powers which they possess for making the system useful: they could have carried out at any time the second of the three courses, to which I have referred. They required no new or additional powers for this; and if they required new or additional powers for enforcing any other salutary reform, they ought to have applied to the legislature. But, instead of this, they have left themselves open to the charge of acquiescing in a system, which without promoting education, without encouraging learning, and without assisting the over-wrought clergy, has enabled themselves to heap sinecures—lucrative sinecures—on those who were already sufficiently provided for by benefices. If indeed they had conferred these sinecures upon the poor working curates, to assist them in their deep poverty,—if they had conferred them upon those laborious men who have expended their health and strength, and have broken down in the greatness of their labour for the Gospel,—if they had done this, a murmur had never been heard against the system. But, when these sinecures, with scarcely a single exception, were conferred upon those who already had benefices elsewhere, and were already amply paid for the duties they performed, it must cease to be a matter for wonder that the wise and the good in the land should have reclaimed against the system."—pp. 62, 63.

We must again remind Mr. Seymour that not merely the bishops, but the government, have pursued the course of which he complains, and that it is rather hard to fix the blame on the episcopate solely, even though more might have been expected from them than from mere secular rulers. But we must really add, in apology for the episcopate generally, that the case before us is one which many truly good and conscientious men view somewhat differently from Mr. Seymour. They are convinced that the welfare of the Church generally, and its influence on the community at large, depends essentially on the existence of *prizes* in the Church, by which men of superior talents, and men of good family, may be induced to take holy orders, on the expectation of attaining as large emoluments in the Church as if they entered some other profession. And therefore they look with the highest satisfaction on the accumulation of benefices of all kinds, and of the largest amount on individuals. They see no evil in the old system of canons with incomes varying from 500*l.* to 5000*l.* a year, holding other benefices to the amount of 5000*l.* a year more. They would think it positively beneficial to see a dignified clergyman in the receipt of 10,000*l.* or 15,000*l.* a year.

This is the principle which has been acted on, and continues to be acted on, as far as possible. We can only express our dissent from that principle, with all due respect for the many distinguished and eminent individuals in Church and State who hold it; but Mr. Seymour may depend upon it, that his view of the case will be opposed *on principle* by most influential parties.

The cathedral system, in its present aspect, has been handed down to us from ages anterior to the Reformation. The true principle on which its reform should be conducted is, in our opinion, to act, as far as possible, on the will of founders, on the original statutes of cathedrals, modified according to the change of circumstances, so as to elicit from those foundations the greatest amount of spiritual utility of which they are capable, always bearing in mind the great principle of restoring *residence*, and maintaining the cathedral service in its fullest effectiveness.

It is really a curious fact, and one of which we were not aware, that the attendance in the great foreign cathedrals is as small as in our own. In Milan the attendance on Sunday under the most favourable circumstances was only 120. At Lucca, again, the attendance is thus described:—

"We visited the Duomo, or cathedral, of Lucca: a service was performing as we entered, and no less than sixteen priests took part in its performance. The performers were *sixteen priests*, and the spectators —for I cannot well call them worshippers—were only *two persons*, exclusive of ourselves!

"We visited it again the next morning, under the impression that we had seen it at an unfavourable hour; and we therefore attended at the hour of the morning when the mass is celebrating, and the largest congregations usually attend. There were three masses performing, by three priests, at their different altars, at one and the same moment. At one of these, there were *three* worshippers; at the second, there were *two* worshippers; and at the third, there were *four* persons worshipping; so that, although there were three priests with their three masses, and their three attendant boys at the altars, yet the whole assembled congregation amounted to no more than *nine* persons! At the conclusion of all these three masses, the priests retired, and soon appeared again with others, making altogether the number of ten priests. They proceeded to one of the altars, and commenced some service, which seemed to me to be devoutly attended to by two of the number, but most irreverently performed by the others. On this occasion, not one soul, except my wife and myself, went near them, or listened to them!"—pp. 126, 127.

And now for St. Peter's itself:—

"Even at St. Peter's, on ordinary days, when no high ceremony is expected, and when I have witnessed five or six masses all celebrating

at so many different altars at the same time, I have reckoned sometimes not more than three or four persons at each; and, on many occasions, I have observed the mass wholly neglected, and without one person in attendance beyond the official assistant! There are, however, some occasions on which, and some churches where, a comparatively large number is certain to attend. Very seldom, however, except on occasion of the high ceremonies, does the number exceed eighty or a hundred, even in the most favourite churches."—pp. 379, 380.

On the whole, we think it is pretty clear, from Mr. Seymour's observations, that the daily service of the Church of England is quite as well attended as any daily services in the Church of Rome; and that the usual Sunday services are attended amongst us by congregations quite equal in numbers, in propriety of demeanour, and in devotion, to those of Romish countries; and this, though we have neither the centre of attraction presented by the mass, with its attendant ceremonies, nor the same amount of pomp and decoration as in the Roman Church. The vespers appear to be badly attended in general:—

"Although thus a few solitary persons may be seen entering the churches, yet generally the attendance at the service in the afternoon is as small as can well be imagined. We have frequently witnessed the vespers celebrated, sometimes by two, sometimes by three, sometimes by ten priests, and not a single individual to form or represent a congregation."—p. 382.

This is curious enough; and what follows is still more so. It appears plainly that if we, in England, attach rather too much importance to the sermon, and if some of us esteem it more highly than the prayers, our Roman Catholic brethren are precisely in the same predicament:—

"It is at Rome as in England, and among Romanists as among Protestants, where there is a sermon there is a comparatively large attendance, varying, of course, according to the popular talents of the preacher. Sermons are seldom preached at Rome, except during the season of Advent to the Epiphany, and during the season of Lent. For fully two-thirds of the year, for eight months of the twelve, there are few or no sermons, except on special occasions; and, therefore, when the season for sermons comes round, the people, who are fond of them, are eager to attend; and the attendance is considerable. We constantly attended to hear these sermons: and we have heard some even in these seasons, when the hearers are not twenty in number, while we have witnessed an attendance of perhaps 500 persons when there was a popular preacher."—p. 382.

How many churches are there not in London, and throughout

England, in which not merely *hundreds*, but *thousands*, of attentive hearers are present every Sunday in the year!

But now comes an important question. How are those who attend the services of the Church in the Roman communion occupied while it is going on? Do they join in the service? Do they take any part in it? Do they attend to it? Are they reverential in their demeanour? Now here, of course, we must be prepared for an extraordinary diversity from any thing that ever happens in our churches, because the mass of the congregation in the Romish churches do not understand a word of the language in which divine service is performed. They understand Latin as little as we do; yet they are bound to be *present*. In order, therefore, that they may not be wholly idle, but may have some religious and devotional exercise, though they do not understand the words of the priest, they are obliged to have recourse to a variety of expedients:—

"The poorer and more ignorant classes all kneel and pay their devotions in whatever part of the church they please, being, by an admirable arrangement, and one well worthy of imitation, as free and welcome as their richer neighbours. While kneeling, they are generally occupied in prayer, not however in attending to the words of the priest, while celebrating the service of the mass, joining with him in prayer or praise, or the Gospel, or Epistle. He may pray, but they do not hear him; he may praise, but they do not heed him; he may read the Scriptures, but they mind him not: all he says is in Latin; whether he read the confession, or the consecration, or the Gospel, all is in Latin, and in a compressed voice, so that no one hears him; and even hearing him no one understands. The poor people, therefore, continue their own devotions, perfectly distinct from his devotions; their prayers are altogether distinct from his prayers; their service has nothing in common with his service; but, instead of attending to him, and joining with him, they are all occupied in telling their beads. This, perhaps, requires explanation:—They have a string of beads, every tenth bead being different from the others: holding one of the common beads in their fingers, they repeat the 'Hail, Mary,' &c., and so with the next bead, and the next, till they have said nine of these short prayers, holding the nine beads in succession. They then hold the tenth, or different bead, and repeat the Lord's Prayer. Having said this, they pass to the common beads again, and so the same series is again and again resumed . . . . The people, wholly inattentive to him [the priest], and taking no part whatever with him, regard all his proceedings as *his* affair, as *his* service, to be performed *for* them, and not participated in *by* them. They therefore repeat their own prayers, in such form as may please them best; and it is only when the attendant at the altar rings the bell, to announce to them the elevation of the host, that they cease from their private prayers, and,

kneeling to adore the host, return, after the ringing of the bell, at the elevation of the cup, to their private prayers as before."—pp. 384, 385.

Such is the worship of the lower classes in the Roman Church. But how do the higher classes act? Do they take any part in the service with the minister, or accompany him in his offices of prayer and praise to God?—By no means. They act exactly on the same principle as the lower orders. Each conducts his devotions separately, and in a different way; each brings his favourite book of devotions. Gentlemen and ladies appear with their favourite books of prayer; monks and priests are there with their breviaries or favourite authors; bishops and cardinals attend with their offices, or other books of devotion. Some have translations of part of the service; but each has his own book, and, in almost all cases, a book quite different from that which the priest employs. Mr. Seymour looked into these books, and found one of them a book of psalms, another a book of devout meditations, another a breviary, another a volume of prayers to the Virgin Mary:—

"I have stood in that part of the Sistine chapel, where I could overlook the books of five or six of the cardinals, and no two of them were reading the same thing. I have repeatedly observed this, and say most solemnly, that, except during the holy week, when they followed some of the services, I never saw them reading the same place with the officiating cardinal. In the general congregations of the churches in Rome, one person has a breviary, another an office; one person is reading a psalm, another a litany; one is reading some devout meditation, another offering some prayer to the Virgin; one is earnestly praying to St. Catherine, another devoutly praying to St. Cecilia. It is among them precisely the same as it would be among us, if in a Protestant Church one person were reading Nelson's Fasts and Festivals, and another Barrow's Sermons; or as if, having the Book of Common Prayer, one was reading the Litany, and another the Communion; one the Psalms, and another the Ten Commandments; or as if, while the clergyman read the lesson from Isaiah, one of the congregation was reading from the Book of Samuel, and another from Revelation, while no one heard the clergyman, no one heeded him; and all had their favourite books of devotion, and were occupied exclusively with them."—p. 387.

Such is the effect of the retention of the Latin language in the offices of the Church, when it has ceased to be vernacular. The result is, that, in the Church of Rome, there is no united offering of prayer and praise in the most solemn service of all—the holy Eucharist. The office of the mass throughout supposes united prayer: it is always expressed in the plural number. The

priest in all parts speaks as leading the congregation. He addresses himself to them. The whole office supposes united prayer to be offered up; and yet there is no such thing in fact. Each member of the congregation prays to whomsoever or about whatever he chooses, leaving the priest to proceed with *his* service; and paying no attention to his "Oremus," or his "Dominus Vobiscum," or his "Sursum Corda," or any thing else except the elevation of the host. The mass, therefore, becomes, *of necessity*, a service offered by the priest alone: the people *can* take no part in it, and accordingly they are taught to employ themselves in any devotional exercises they can manage to learn. There is no other remedy; for it would not answer to leave them wholly unemployed while the mass is going on. So that, in order to preserve intact the Latin of the mass, the essential character and meaning of the mass itself, as a united act of Christian worship, is sacrificed, and the chief act of worship in the Christian Church is converted into a scene of confusion and disorder, to which the confusion at the Tower of Babel affords the only just and fair parallel. In order to maintain the *Latin* phraseology, the Church is deprived of the blessed privilege of united prayer for God's grace, and united thanksgiving for God's mercy in Christ Jesus: its devotions are narrowed into a thousand individual supplications or meditations different in kind: and, assuredly, this disorderly and divided mode of worship cannot look for the accomplishment of the promise of Jesus Christ made to the *united* prayer of his disciples.

What benefit or advantage, or what obligation there can be to be present at mass at all, when no attention is paid to the mass, we cannot conceive. We know that it is, in fact, a matter of obligation; but on what *principle* that obligation can be founded, when there is no part to be taken by those who are present, except bowing at a certain moment, is not easily to be discerned. If the mass is only offered *for* them, might it not be offered just as effectually in their absence, as in their presence? And if they have no part to take in the worship, why should not their meditations and devotions be as effective at home as if they were offered in the time of mass?

The truth is, that the whole system is in direct contradiction to the plainest dictates of Christian wisdom, and to the universal practice of primitive times. It is one of those cases in which men, by catching at the mere letter of institutions and ordinances, have wholly lost their spirit, and rendered the letter itself an absurdity. The mass is now, notwithstanding its rigid retention of a Latin garb, a positive absurdity, in its addresses to congregations who are unable to understand a single word of it,

or are taught to pay no attention; and in its plural prayers, which only one individual offers up.

The description which Mr. Seymour gives of the monasteries in Italy effectually dissipates any ideas that might be formed of them from the pages of St. Bernard or of other ancient writers. All austerity is at an end, as regards, at least, that class of monasteries which is intended for the reception of the younger sons of the nobility and gentry. Many of these convents are richly endowed, and conducted in excellent style, with many comforts, and without rigid discipline. The mode of life is like that of some members of the English Universities. The members of the Society live in their rooms, dine together, gossip together, attend the services in the chapel, and, if they like, read. They possess pleasant gardens, a good library, an excellent table, with well-furnished apartments.

"In one establishment—through the whole of which I was kindly conducted by one of its members—there was appropriated to each a suite of small apartments, consisting of a sitting-room, a sleeping-room, and a little study, all opening into another vacant apartment, or hall, or gallery; and the whole being separated by a door from all the rest of the establishment. There were twenty-two gentlemen living in this convent, every one of them possessing a similar suite of apartments. And though to the eye of one accustomed to the comforts of an English house, there always seemed a lack of comfort about these establishments; yet such is the general character of an Italian house. And I am bound in candour and honesty to say, that the bachelor life of a convent in Italy is in every respect, considering the two countries, equal in comforts and in society and enjoyment to the general run of a college life in England. . . . The freedom with which they can leave their convents, ramble through the country, lounge through the streets, frequent the coffee-houses, and visit the drawing-rooms of their female acquaintances, gives them the opportunity of enjoying life, and unhappily also of bringing occasionally much scandal on religion.

"I do not feel disposed to attribute to the monks and friars of Rome any special irregularity or impropriety of life. Every one knows, who has any knowledge of the world, that when a number of unmarried men are living together in a barrack, or residing together in a college, the atmosphere of such places is not more pure and moral than elsewhere. The experience of the world has long since settled this matter. Now the convents of the higher classes in Italy are neither more nor less than large boarding-houses for the younger sons of the aristocracy, —a sort of club, arranged in an Italian fashion, where they can live cheaply and well; and keeping the society of those who are in every respect their equals, within the establishment, and at all times go forth to enjoy any society more suited to their tastes, without the establishment."—pp. 177, 178.

What would St. Anthony, or St. Pachomius, or St. Bernard say to all this? What would they think of those "gentlemen," who "are seen in the drawing-room, and in the billiard-room, and at the gaming-table, and in every place of fashion or amusement?" All this may be very agreeable, and very gentlemanly, and so forth; but certainly it is a misnomer to call establishments of this kind monasteries. They are well-managed *boarding-houses*, as Mr. Seymour calls them.

The monasteries intended for the reception of the poorer classes are chiefly those of the Franciscans and the Capuchins, the filth of whose persons, and the odour of their clothes, are familiar, as Mr. Seymour remarks, to every traveller. Mr. Seymour was taken through one of their convents, which contained 170 monks. It was a large building, arranged much like a barrack for troops, only that each monk had a room of his own. "The dirt and stench of these little rooms, equalled only by a squalid garret in St. Giles's, in London, exceeds any possible description, and was only rivalled by the disgusting and loathsome dirt and stench of the monks who inhabited them." The chapel and infirmary were good.

"I found that it required no money to secure admission, as the establishment was so miserably endowed, and its members so wretchedly poor, that no person with five pounds in the world would enter it. But all those persons or classes of persons who ought to be domestic servants, but were unwilling to work, or who ought to handle a spade or a pitchfork as agricultural labourers, but preferred a life of laziness and idleness to one of labour and industry,—a matter of rather general occurrence in Italy,—could obtain room in this and similar convents, and secure a wretched subsistence, by wearing the dress of the order, and taking the usual vows. These lazy, idle, dirty fellows were of every age. The great majority of them varied from twenty-five to forty years of age. And all without exception seemed of the class of the lowest labouring population; many of these monks being unable to read or write; so that, though the establishment might in theory be regarded by some minds as a holy and Christian home and retreat for pious and devoted men from the lower classes of society, yet in actual practice it was a sort of overgrown almshouse, a sort of union poor-house, the inmates of which were not the sick and the infirm and the aged, as in England, but the strong, the active, the healthy, and the able-bodied of the population, who ought to have been compelled to labour for their support. And as for this and the other similar establishments of Franciscans and Capuchins, as houses for the pious and holy, it needs not that any man should be informed that the inmates are often the most vicious and depraved even in Italy."—p. 181.

This certainly presents no very pleasing picture of the convents for the lower orders in Italy. It sadly mars the romance attendant on this notion, to find that their inmates are so extremely dirty in their habits. Filth can hardly be regarded as an essential feature in monastic life; for if so, we are at a loss to account for its absence from the convents inhabited by gentlemen. The inference, then, is, that the dirty and slovenly habits of the lower orders find their way into convents inhabited by them, and that the filth of Capuchins and Franciscans simply arises from their low habits previously to their admission as friars.

The ceremony of taking the veil is usually invested with every possible circumstance calculated to produce an effect on the minds of spectators. The pomp and publicity which is invariably given to displays of this kind both in Italy and in England, and of which Mr. Seymour gives many very curious instances, are especially designed for the purpose of inducing women to devote themselves to a conventual life. But whatever may be the motives which lead persons in England to enter on this state, they are not, at least, under the *moral necessity* which appears to exist in Italy for taking such a step. It appears from Mr. Seymour's statements, that all classes of persons in Italy are agreed, that such is the vitiated state of the moral atmosphere in that country, that female purity is exposed to the greatest danger, and can scarcely be preserved intact except within the walls of a monastery! This was the continually-expressed opinion of the most eminent preachers, and of women of irreproachable character, mothers of families. Such a fact speaks volumes as to the state of morals in Italy.

The convent also forms a convenient way of disposing of unmarried daughters; and the parent of this class of gentry, who pays from 200*l.* to 500*l.* to settle his daughter in a sisterhood, is relieved from all further care for her support, while he knows that she will possess every thing needful for her rank in life. In the more expensive convents, sums varying from 500*l.* to 1000*l.*, according to the amount of luxury and comfort provided, are requisite.

The novice, when placed by her parents at a convent, becomes at once subject to such an amount of pressure from the state of public opinion and from the resolution of her own parents, that she is virtually, though not legally, *compelled* to take the black veil at the expiration of her novitiate. Mr. Seymour gives some interesting accounts of the ceremony of taking the white veil. On these occasions, in Italy, as well as in this country, the postulant appears, in the first instance, clad in the utmost splendour and magnificence; and the congregation are led to wonder at the sublime self-denial which can induce a woman to relinquish so

much which captivates the senses, and consign her youth and beauty, and accomplishments, to the retirement of the cloister. One of these scenes is ably pourtrayed by Mr. Seymour.

"On approaching the monastery I was struck with the profusion of flowers that strewed the entrance. Early as the season then was, when in our colder climate there is neither bloom nor perfume, neither verdure nor blossom for the flower, there was a profusion of what seemed to me to be wild flowers, of every hue of the rainbow, mingling with sprigs of leafy green from many and various shrubs. . . . Even the street in which the monastery stands was strewn to a considerable extent with those emblems of rejoicing at the nuptials of one more maiden to her heavenly Spouse. It is in this light they affect to regard such events."

We must pass over part of the description, and come at once to the principal personage.

"In a few moments the destined bride of Jesus Christ entered. She was led into the chapel, and along the aisle, by the Princess Borghese. They knelt for a few minutes at the side-altar, and then the princess conducted her to the cardinal-vicar. They both knelt to him, and as the candidate bent her head, her long rich tresses of chestnut-coloured hair fell like a veil around her, and gave her a peculiar interest. . . . . This destined recluse, or bride of Jesus Christ, was dressed specially for the occasion. Her dress was white satin, richly damasked in gold. Her head was adorned with a diadem of diamonds, beneath which fell a profusion of long and luxuriant curls of rich chestnut-coloured hair. Her neck was covered with precious stones, that flashed through the many ringlets that fell among them. Her breast was gemmed with brilliants set off by black velvet, so that she sparkled and blazed in all the magnificence of the jewels of the Borghese family, said to be among the most costly and splendid in Italy."—p. 226.

This splendid lady, having paid her devotions, and having heard a sermon delivered by a reverend confessor in a very effective way, was subsequently conducted out of the chapel, into a room within a grating, where the following scene was witnessed by our author:—

"They affected to be very anxious to see for themselves; but on this as on all similar occasions, they endeavoured to make every thing mysterious by concealment. I was resolved, however, that I would not be disappointed; and I found them sufficiently courteous not to prevent me looking over the shoulder of a priest. The destined nun was on her knees, inside the grating. The Princess Borghese was beside her, directing her maid to take off the tiara and other jewels; no other hands—not even the hands of the nuns, were allowed to touch a diamond, they were the jewels of the Borghese family, and the princess and her maid watched every stone till they were all carefully removed by their own

hands, and deposited safely from any light fingers that might possibly be present, even in the sacred interior of a monastery of nuns! At last every diamond was gone; and then the hair—the beautiful hair with its luxuriant tresses, its long, wreathy ringlets of rich and shining chestnut, was to be now cut off. It was the loveliest charm she possessed; and in parting with the world, its pleasures and its sorrows together, she was to part with that which, of all else, had attracted the admiration of men: she meekly bowed her head to her sad destiny. Lo! they touched it, and it was gone! as if by a miracle, it was gone! Alas! that the pen must write the truth,—it was A WIG."—p. 231.

Such things as this certainly throw a new light on the romantic ceremonial of a profession.

"A chiel's amang you takin' notes,
And faith he'll prent 'em."

Professions of nuns are evidently *imposing*, in more senses than one. They look very well in print, and they appear so to the eye; but if an observer like Mr. Seymour could tell us the real facts of each case, disclose the prudential motives which have dictated the choice of a monastic life, and detail the contrivances by which display has been effected, we should look on the whole affair in a different light. In the case here mentioned, the "lovely postulant" was a vulgar-looking woman of more than forty years of age, a maid-servant of Princess Borghese, who thus exchanged a menial condition for a most respectable establishment, in which she was the equal of all its inhabitants. We wonder what the founders of the monastic institute would have thought of all this display of these bewigged and bejewelled candidates for admission into their cloisters. Does it not look very much as if those who were about to forsake the world were anxious to have at least one *very deep* draught of its pleasures before resigning them? It is probably on the same principle that the Italians make themselves amends beforehand for the abstinence of Lent, by the feasting and gaiety of the Carnival.

We must, with regret, pass over much that is interesting in this volume, especially the description of the high ceremonies at Rome at Easter and on other great occasions, which are clearly and well explained and justly criticized, and pass on to one or two curious illustrations of the religious amusements of Rome.

It was at the church where the Bambino (a little wooden image of our Lord about two feet long, held in immense veneration by the people) is worshipped, that our author came one day on the following curious scene:—

"While multitudes of persons, almost exclusively of the lower orders,

were arriving and departing in increasing succession, we observed a little girl of about ten years of age, dressed modestly, and not unlike a nun, elevated on a platform, and preaching to a large congregation. She concluded at the moment we arrived within hearing, and was immediately succeeded by a little boy of about the same age. He was robed in the ordinary dress of the clergy, with cassock and short surplice, with the usual cap worn by the priests in the churches. He was a perfect miniature of a priest. There was not a smile on his little face, he looked grave and serious. He seemed as if he felt what and whom he represented. The moment he took his place, he proceeded with the utmost gravity to lift his cap in the usual way, and then to cross himself, and then to kneel in private prayer. He arose and resumed his cap, took out his white handkerchief and used it, looked gravely at the people, repeated a few words, again took off his cap, and after thus mimicking with the most perfect accuracy every thing the priests and monks are in the habit of doing when going to preach, and at the same time mimicking them with a gravity of look and manner exceedingly droll in so young a child, he actually commenced a sermon. So admirably did the little fellow bear himself, that I could not divine whether all this was done in sober seriousness, or in mockery of the priests and monks, especially as the child was incomparably schooled in the acting. In all that required acting, the movement of the limbs, and the expression of the face, he was inimitable, so that while he acted throughout with the utmost gravity, the whole congregation, consisting of men and women, monks and children, laughed long and loud at what seemed to them an admirable imitation of their preaching priests. And yet the sermon otherwise was not one to be laughed at. It was well and carefully written, and the little fellow had learned it by heart, and had most carefully been trained to go through every portion of it. He would now address himself to the fashionable, now to the careless, now to the wicked. He would then appeal to the heavens, then to the earth, then to the Bambino, with his hand outstretched, and his finger pointing to the scene before described. At one time his hands were clasped, and his head hung upon his breast with an expression of deep sorrow. At another time his arms were flung wide, and his little face turned as towards heaven in the expression of adoration. Then at the conclusion of each paragraph or division of his discourse, he would, in the most cool, collected, and solemn way, so as to excite considerable laughter, draw forth his handkerchief, and apply it to his face, and then pause and prepare for again proceeding."—pp. 354—357.

It appears that this was connected with some school exhibition; but really, considering that it was in a church, we think "the monks and friars, who came in considerable numbers," might have abstained from "laughing aloud and clapping their hands." That the mass of the people "looked on and laughed and joked, as if it were an amusing species of Punch and Judy," cannot be any matter of surprise.

In truth, it is not in England alone that the people evince a want of sufficient respect for the temples of God. The same kind of levity and disrespect prevails to a still greater degree in Italy. We have just had an instance; here is another:—

"When we entered this church [at Genoa] to witness the vespers with music and a procession, we were surprised at the extreme irreverence that marked the whole bearing and conduct of the congregation. A very few poor women were kneeling as if in worship, many were seated on benches in conversation, while the great majority of the congregation were walking about the church, laughing together, and acting in a manner irreconcilable to all our English notions of propriety and decency, to say nothing of reverence. . . . . And as soldiers in their brilliant uniform, civilians in their showiest attire, young girls in their jendulas, monks in their sombre dresses, all moved before us, and chatted and made a regular promenade of the church, as if utterly indifferent to the religious character of the place, while we were looking and wondering at all, a respectable-looking woman took her seat beside us: she seemed rapt in devotion for some moments, repeated her prayers in a gently audible tone, and then slily slipt her hand before me, and asked for money, for the sake of the blessed Virgin! She could not take a refusal gently given, but persevered; so we removed to another place to avoid her. . . . . We soon stopped and stood in the centre of the church, and were observing the bright and lively appearance of the congregation, as they passed by and around us, when we were more particularly struck by the conduct of the monks. There were many of them there,—some chatting with young men, some conversing with young women, others standing in groups. . . . . I must confess that our astonishment was extreme when we observed these men chatting, laughing, and promenading with as much levity as the youngest and gayest of the congregation."

After the author had several times been applied to for alms by persons who had previously endeavoured to attract his attention by making a great show of devotion, the service commenced. The congregation did not take any part whatever, or join in the responses.

"During the pauses in the services, there were several splendid interludes, or perhaps, more strictly speaking, operatic music of the very highest order. Nothing I had ever heard in the way of music surpassed it; but it was precisely that which may be heard at the opera, and certainly is not often heard elsewhere. Some of the pieces were very grand, some were very sweet and pretty, some were very lively and brilliant. Every thing,—the brilliant lights, the shining dresses, the conversation, the promenade, the gallantry, the coquetry, and especially the character of the music, threw over all the tone and style of some musical entertainment at a theatre; and at times, there flashed

across my mind, the promenade in Kensington Gardens, when the military band was there; all was as brilliant, as merry, and as gay. I looked carefully throughout the church, while the priests were in the act of officiating, and I could observe but one man kneeling, and one woman leaning on a chair in a half-kneeling posture."—pp. 107—111.

There is a great deal to be gathered from all this; but we think that Mr. Seymour might as well have abstained from the remarks which he has appended on English cathedral service and the practice of intoning the prayers (pp. 114—116). It may be, and is true, that there are persons who attend cathedral service more as a musical display than as the worship of God; and it may be, that Mr. Seymour himself cannot follow the cathedral service with feelings of devotion, or without a great effort. But, unquestionably, to very many others, the cathedral service is an aid to devotional feelings, and they would most keenly feel the deprivation of such a service. The increasing number of churches in which this service is to a greater or less extent performed, and the large attendance, and devotional demeanour of the congregations, are sufficient evidence that no inconsiderable part of the community look on the musical services of the Church of England with very different feelings indeed from those expressed by Mr. Seymour. What we have to complain of, in many of our cathedrals, is, the slovenly, irreverential, and ineffective performance of that service; so badly managed indeed has it been, even in some of our principal cathedrals, that some have often felt, that if the service were to remain thus, profaned by the levity and indevotional character of singing men and choristers, it were far better that it should perish. Our cathedral service too, frequently, is any thing but an inviting musical treat. But where it is reverentially, solemnly, and well executed —when the music is appropriate and accordant in style with the sacred character of the offices it is employed in, we cannot conceive on earth a higher enjoyment or a more efficient aid to devotion. Were the cathedral service what it ought to be, we should find it far more numerously attended than it now is; and we hope that the day of improvement is at hand, and that all choirs may stand in the efficient and respectable position occupied by those of Exeter and of Canterbury.

Having thus discharged a duty in protesting against Mr. Seymour's notions on cathedral service, we must bring our remarks to a close, with an expression of the high sense we entertain of the substantial value of his "Pilgrimage to Rome." There are things here and there which we could wish otherwise, and which must render his volume less acceptable to Churchmen

than his " Mornings with the Jesuits." We think that his work might be made more generally popular, and therefore more useful, by being subjected to a careful revision, with a view to remove casual expressions and sentiments which will give needless offence to the very persons to whom his work might otherwise be most useful and beneficial. And having said this, we must conclude with expressing the gratification, and the instruction which we have derived from this very able and deeply interesting volume. It is a work which deserves to be carefully studied by all classes of Churchmen ; and it meets a great want which was felt to exist for authentic information on the every-day-life working of the system of the Church of Rome.

ART. VI.—1. *Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Italy.* Part I. 1846—1849. *Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty*, July, 1849. Part II. From January to June 30, 1848. *Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty*, July 31, 1849.

2. *Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Rome. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty*, Jan. 15, 1849.

3. *Ma Mission à Rome. Mai*, 1849. *Mémoire présenté au Conseil d'Etat. Par* M. FERDINAND DE LESSEPS. Paris: Amyot. 1849.

4. *Réponse de M. F. de Lesseps au Ministre et au Conseil d'Etat. Août*, 1849. Paris: Amyot. 1849.

EIGHTEEN months ago we parted with the Pope at Rome [1]. His resolution to uphold, in all its pristine pride, his pseudo-Apostolic power, was unshaken, but his strength was utterly broken. The attempt which characterized the commencement of his reign, to make the democracy throughout Europe subservient to the aggrandizement of the Papacy, and to the restoration of its former ascendancy in the political world, had borne its legitimate fruit. The Constitution of March 14th, which carried concession, according to the then declaration of Pius himself, to its utmost limits, had been extorted from the fears of the Pontiff by popular clamour; the Order of Jesuits, the pillar of the Papacy, though standing high in the personal favour of Pius himself, had been forced to yield before the storm, and to withdraw from the eternal city; the revolution, for such it was, of the first days of May, 1848, the result of the Allocution of April 29th, had deprived the Pope of all real control over the foreign relations of the Pontifical States; and for his own personal popularity, or rather for his deliverance from the most menacing storm of unpopularity, the once idolized Pius stood indebted to the patronage of one formerly branded by the Church with the mark of heresy, and driven into exile as a political offender.

Virtually the Papacy was deposed in Rome itself in May, 1848. The shadow only of the Pope's sovereignty remained. The

[1] See "The Papacy and the Revolution," *English Review*, vol. ix. pp. 255—285.

ministry of Count Mamiani, reconstructed in August by one of its members, the unfortunate Count Rossi, in vain endeavoured to reconcile the violent demands of the democracy, and the popular aspirations after an Italian nationality, with the spiritual supremacy of the Pope, and with the relations in which, as the head of the Roman Church, he stood to the "Catholic" world. The hopeless struggle ended in the assassination of Count Rossi, and the ignominious flight of the Pope in the month of November, 1848,—events which are, no doubt, fresh in the recollection of our readers, and which we need not therefore recapitulate. This was a death-blow, not only to the temporal, but to the spiritual power of the Pope. The charge of ingratitude, contained in the protest issued by Pius IX. on the 29th of November [2], sat lightly on the consciences of his rebellious subjects, who on the 12th of December committed the government of the State provisionally to a Junta, in which the sovereignty was vested until the Pope should return to his dominions. The protest of Pius against the Junta, and his subsequent Bull of excommunication [3], failed of producing the desired effect. The election of the Constituent Assembly was proceeded with, the Pope's spiritual censure was treated with every indignity which enmity and profaneness combined could devise [4]; and on the 9th of February of the present year the deposition of the Pope, and the constitution of the Roman Republic, was solemnly proclaimed on the Capitol; a final and decisive step which induced the Pope, in a circular issued by Cardinal Antonelli on the 18th of February, to invoke the armed intervention of the European powers for the restoration of the Papacy.

At this point, then, commences the history of the open warfare in which the Papacy has been engaged with the republican principle, and in which it has been supported, not only by the ancient "Catholic" monarchies of Europe, but, strange to say, indirectly by Protestant England, and directly by republican France. The three months, or nearly so, which had elapsed since the assassination of Count Rossi and the flight of the Pope, had been consumed in fruitless endeavours made by both parties to secure their own ends without coming to an open rupture; the revolutionary party at Rome seeking at first to prevail upon Pius to return and continue to lend the sanction of his name to their proceedings,

[2] See our "Foreign and Colonial Intelligence," *English Review*, vol. x. pp. 488, 489.

[3] See our "Foreign and Colonial Intelligence," *English Review*, vol. xi. pp. 232—235.

[4] See for the details our "Foreign and Colonial Intelligence," *English Review*, vol. xi. pp. 235—238.

and, even after the refusal of Pius to receive their overtures, hesitating to make any other than a temporary provision for the administration of the Government, in the still cherished hope of rendering the weakness of the Pontiff's character subservient to their designs; while, on the other hand, the Pope tried the various weapons with which the armoury of his authority, both temporal and spiritual, supplied him, in the hope of bringing his revolted subjects back to their obedience by exhortation and remonstrance. It was not until all these expedients had been resorted to in vain; when all chance of a peaceable accommodation was clearly at an end; when the Romans were clearly convinced that the Pope would not abate one jot or tittle from his ecclesiastical pretensions, nor give for the maintenance of free institutions the guarantees which his people demanded of him; and when Pius could no longer disguise from himself that upon no account the Romans would again willingly submit to the bastard sovereignty of an ecclesiastical power;—not till then it was, that both parties took a course involving open and irrevocable hostility, and evincing a determination at all costs to maintain their respective claims; the Romans their claim to civil freedom, the Pope his claim to absolute and irresponsible dominion. This being the critical point, at which the Romans became decidedly republican, and the Pope avowedly reactionary, it will not be uninteresting to examine somewhat more minutely the documents from which the temper and spirit of both parties and the view which they took of their position may be collected.

The decree of the Roman Assembly, which cut off all possibility of reconciliation with the Pope, was the result of a protracted debate of fourteen hours, in the course of which Mamiani and Sterbini, with a few others, alone had the courage to oppose the general determination to do away with the Papal sovereignty altogether: out of 144 members five only voted against the proposal to proclaim the republic; fourteen, though they voted for the deposition of the Pope, were not prepared to vote for the republican form of government; while all the rest voted both for the deposition of the Pope and for the proclamation of the republic. The decree of the Assembly, enacted by this overwhelming majority, was as follows:—

Fundamental Decree.

"*Art.* 1. The Pope is deposed, *de facto* and *de jure*, from the temporal government of the Roman State.

"*Art.* 2. The Roman Pontiff shall have all the necessary guarantees of independence in the exercise of his spiritual power.

"*Art.* 3. The form of government of the Roman State shall be

a pure democracy, under the glorious name of 'the Roman Republic.'

"*Art.* 4. The Roman Republic will entertain with the rest of Italy those relations which are demanded by a common nationality[5]."

This decree, dated "February the 9th, at one o'clock in the morning," was proclaimed in the Capitol at noon on the same day; and, after the ceremony, the following proclamation was published by the ministry:—

"A great fact has been accomplished. The National Assembly, consisting of our lawful representatives, has, in the name of the sovereignty of the people, concluded, that the only form of government suitable for us is that which rendered our forefathers so great and glorious.

"Accordingly the Roman Republic has been decreed by the Assembly, and proclaimed this day from the Capitol.

"Every citizen, who is not an enemy of his country, is bound to give his prompt and loyal adhesion to this government, which, sprung from the free and universal vote of the representatives of the nation, will proceed in the paths of order and justice.

"After so many centuries, we behold our country and our liberty restored; let us prove ourselves worthy of this gift of God, and the Roman Republic will be eternal and prosperous."

A circular was at the same time addressed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Roman Ministers and Consuls abroad, for the purpose of announcing to them the proclamation of the Republic, and the confirmation of the Government Commission by the Assembly, and of inducing them to acknowledge with as little delay as possible the Roman Republic, which, it is said in the circular, "having sprung from the free vote of the people, is, as a matter both of right and of fact, the most legitimate government in the world." On the following day an Executive Council of three,—Italians, responsible and removable—was appointed by the Assembly; the first Triumvirs were Armellini, Salicetti, and Montecchi; the first of whom retained his position to the last, while the other two were subsequently replaced by Mazzini and Saffi. Two days after, another decree passed the Assembly, ordering the laws to be promulgated and justice administered 'in the name of God and the people;' adopting the tricoloured flag, with an eagle, as the national standard; and re-

[5] Although we have enumerated, at the head of this article, several documentary collections and authentic publications, yet, as there are many documents connected with the history of these transactions not contained in them, we shall freely quote from the public journals, without deeming it necessary to indicate the particular source from which we have taken each document.

leasing all civil and military functionaries from the oaths which they had taken to the late government.

Thus far, unquestionably, the change which had been effected, was the work of the Romans themselves; but it is fair to mention, that at this period the influence of Mazzini, who had already visited Rome in December, but who was at this time staying in Florence, began to manifest itself. On the 25th of February, the *Costituente Italiana* contained an article of three columns, from the pen of Mazzini, and signed with his name, a few extracts from which will best serve to show the character of his views :—

"Rome the sainted, Rome the eternal, has spoken; and her first word is the first word of a new era—the third Italian era. From a period of artificiality, of political sophistry, of immoral machinations, incapable of creating a people and making them into a nation, the Romans now pass on to the broad and brilliant life of truth. The veil has been withdrawn from the lie of an impossible agreement between liberty and a power which had become a dead corpse; between national unity and the mean selfishness of foreign courts or courts in bondage to the foreigner; and we arise in the consciousness of our mission and our strength.

"To the prince who flies when the country awakes fair and radiant with a thought of love and of new life, we say: 'Thou art not worthy to live upon our soil.' To the priest who, untrue to the mission of emancipation committed to him by the First Martyr of humanity, drives the prince to an act of cowardice, and who threatens to anathematize a people eager to interrogate him on the duties and the rights of the new era, we make answer in the words of the Bishop of Gaul: 'Thou camest to excommunicate, and thou shalt depart excommunicated.'

"Religion, betrayed by its ministers, resides in us, who are, in community of sacrifice, of love, and of progress, the Eternal Church of the faithful. Let the phantom vanish before the light of truth. None reigns here but 'God and the people;' God, sovereign in heaven and in earth; the people, progressive worshippers and interpreters of his law. As in the days of Gregory III., we may inscribe on our banners, '*Ecclesia sancti Dei et respublica Romanorum.*'

"But, in order to be resuscitated as a Church and as a republic, we must drink into love, and into the consciousness of originality and autonomy—of an autonomy which shall not be, as some would have it, provincial and dynastic, but Italian."

As a useful gloss upon this rhapsody of mingled Deism and republicanism, we subjoin, from the same document, what may be called Mazzini's profession of faith :—

"To us life is a mission, this earth the stage on which we are to fulfil it in order to elevate ourselves to God. Man is a prefectible and social

being, accordingly progressive perfection is the law of his existence; the means to its attainment association with his fellow-men. The more extensive and intimate that association is, the more strength shall we have for proceeding in the road of improvement.

"We propose, therefore, to place at the top of our social edifice the most excellent in mind and heart, in genius and virtue. We are travellers in the unknown territories of the future, and we mean to confide our destinies, those of our children and grandchildren, and of the generations to come, not to men marked out by chance, or by the privilege and despotism of conquest, but to men of approved intelligence and devotion, to men who shall be constantly forced to lean upon our confidence."

Of this new political and religious creed M. Mazzini was the high priest, the deistical Antipope to the Mariolatrous Pope, Pius IX.; both antagonistic to the Christian faith as well as to each other. It is by thus marking the religious no less than the political character of the two conflicting powers that we obtain the key to the singular drama which has recently been enacted at Rome, and to its significance in the history of the world. To treat the question, as has been done in an exceedingly clever but thoroughly wrong-headed, and in its statements of the facts somewhat unscrupulous article in the *Quarterly*, without reference to the religious considerations involved in it, is to tread in the footsteps of the ingenious author who wrote the history of the Jews without reference to their divine mission. It was not merely the adoption of one set of political views in the place of another; the preference given to a republican Utopia, which promised a reign of universal justice and purity of purpose, over an ecclesiastical government, the abuses, the iniquities, and corruptions of which had become wholly intolerable; but it was the manifestation of the popular unbelief in the long-sustained doctrinal lie of Rome which procured for Mazzini, as the apostle of a new and professedly purer creed, the triumphal reception, bordering on idolatrous veneration, which was given him, when, on the 6th of December, he took his seat, by the side of the president, in the Constituent Assembly of Rome, destined soon to be raised to the chief place of power in the deistical republic.

In that memorable session, the frantic enthusiasm of which, as described by the journals of the day, forcibly recalls to mind the sway which the prestige of tribunician power had over the people of ancient Rome, M. Mazzini delivered himself of a discourse on what he was pleased to call the *unification*, as contradistinguished from the *union*, of Italy, which will serve to complete the sketch already given of his daring and extravagant political system. The immediate occasion of it was the proposal for the union, or,

to conform ourselves to the Mazzinian phraseology, the *unification* of Tuscany with Rome:—

"The general tendencies of Tuscany," said M. Mazzini, "are all in favour of *unification* with Rome. I say *unification* and not *union*, because the latter expression has fallen too much into disrepute. The Tuscan journals are all favourable to this unification, with the exception of one, which says not one word upon the subject, and which by this very silence proves the desire to be so general, that it would be idle to oppose it[6].

"The government and the clubs have pronounced a favourable opinion, and the provisional government would have yielded to this general wish, if it had not been afraid of violating what it calls legality. On one hand I respect this scruple, on the other hand I condemn it. Italy, gentlemen, is in a state of revolution. Now men who head a revolution have no other judge but God, the people, and their conscience. To endeavour to remain within the bounds of legality is to misconceive the very elements of revolutionary government.

"In Tuscany there is no *municipalism*. Autonomy is there understood in its true sense; that is to say, a different meaning is attached to it from that which the first inventor of this word (Gioberti) gave to it, understanding as he did by it the domination of a family, a caste[7].

"The Tuscans recognise in Italy only two autonomies—that of the nation, and that of the city or municipality; and they desire to see them both respected.

"The objections turn upon two points. It is apprehended, 1, that union might impede the administrative business in progress of execution; 2, that the union might interfere with the municipal element.

"As to the first point, the assembly ought to give the assurance that the administrative business will suffer no delay; and on the second point it ought loudly to declare that what it wants is a political *unification*, which may serve to develope social life in all its ramifications, and not an imperialist union or a union *à la Française*."

These few specimens of the terms in which the views of the republican party were propounded will be sufficient to give our readers an idea of the spirit with which the Papacy is at present disputing the allegiance of the public mind of Italy. We may, therefore, now revert to simple matters of fact, and proceed to examine the nature of the constitution, which the Roman republic

[6] This fact which, unexplained, "speaks volumes" in favour of the Mazzini policy, admits, however, of a very different explanation. There were at this time four journals published at Florence; three of which, *La Costituente Italiana*, *L'Alba*, and *Il Popolano*, were entirely under the control of Mazzini's party. The fourth, *Il Nazionale*, had excellent reasons for its silence, having before its eyes the doom of two other journals *La Vespa* and *La Riforma* which had forfeited their existence by their opposition to the dominant faction.

[7] This is probably not the only case in which these new lights fail to understand one another, or even themselves.

imposed upon itself as the fundamental law of the new state of society about to be established. The fundamental principles of it are set forth in the preamble, as follows:—

"The sovereignty residing, of eternal right, in the people, the people of the Roman State have constituted themselves into a Republic.

"The Roman citizens are equal and free.

"The Roman republic honours virtue, and sacrifices made for the brethren and for the country.

"The republic takes upon itself the education of all citizens, in order to enable them to ameliorate their condition by industry, labour, and intelligence.

"All the rights of nationalities are sacred to the Roman republic, which regards all nations as brethren.

"Every citizen is bound to sacrifice his life for the defence of the republic, and of the national independence.

"All the municipalities have equal rights; their independence is limited only by the laws of universal utility.

"The Catholic religion is the religion of the State. The exercise of civil and political rights does not depend on religious belief."

After this preamble the constitution itself is set out in nine chapters, containing eighty-three articles.

The first chapter treats of "the rights and duties of the citizens." Among its provisions is in Article vi., the abolition of capital punishment and of confiscation.

The second chapter treats of "the exercise of the powers." It vests the legislative power in a representative assembly, chosen every three years by universal suffrage, every citizen, at the age of twenty, having a vote; and the number of representatives being at the rate of 1 to every 30,000 citizens. The executive power is placed in the hands of two consuls, chosen by universal suffrage, and requiring, at least, 100,000 votes, in default of which they are to be chosen by the Representative Assembly; one consul to go out of office every year, and not to be re-eligible till the expiration of two years. As a check upon this executive, twelve tribunes are appointed, likewise by universal suffrage, for five years, and immediately re-eligible.

The third chapter defines the powers of the Assembly, which is declared indissoluble, and to which alone it belongs to make war or peace, and to conclude treaties.

The fourth chapter defines the functions of the consuls, and settles the subdivision of the departments of the state.

The fifth chapter defines the attributes of the tribunes, who are inviolable during their term of office, and for a year after. To these the consuls are bound to render an account of their administration, at the close of their year of office: they determine

whether there are grounds for impeachment, and they have the power of convoking, in case of need, extraordinary comitia, or assemblies of the people.

The sixth chapter defines the position of the Council of State, consisting of fifteen members, chosen by the Assembly, whom the consuls are bound to consult on all important affairs of state.

The seventh chapter refers to the administration of justice. The judges are nominated by the consuls, and hold office for life. All judicial proceedings are to be conducted "in the name of God and the people."

The eighth chapter treats of the military power, both by land and by sea. The appointment of general commanders is vested in the Assembly.

The ninth chapter makes all changes in the constitution dependent on the requisition of, at least, one-half of the representatives, and determines that the present constitution shall not be changed till one year, at least, after its promulgation.

The main outline of this constitution is evidently borrowed from the ancient republic. The most remarkable feature of it is the total silence which it observes respecting the papacy, plainly indicating a determination not only to exclude the papacy from all participation in the political power of the state, but to make the machinery of the state wholly independent of its existence.

While republican Rome thus laboured to consolidate its new institutions, the Pope, finally undeceived by the proclamation of the Republic as to the advantages to be gained for the papacy from an alliance with the democracy, began seriously to turn his attention towards the possibility of his forcible restoration by the armed intervention of the European powers. To this end Cardinal Antonelli prepared a memorial, which was communicated to the different Courts of Europe, among others to the British Government through the Marquis of Normanby, to whom it was officially transmitted by the Pope's nuncio at Paris, and which we give *in extenso*, as we find it in the Parliamentary Paper, No. 2, at the head of our Article, but in a translation of our own; the official translation being throughout of a very mediocre character, and in several passages positively erroneous[8]:—

"*Gaeta, February* 18, 1849.

"Our Lord's holiness had, from the very beginning of his Pontificate, nothing else in view but to pour upon his subjects benefits in accordance with the times, making every possible provision for their

[8] Nothing can be more discreditable than the slovenliness and downright ignorance of these official translations. The veriest penny-a-liners could hardly do worse. We should like to see a return of the persons employed and monies expended in the translation department of the Foreign Office.

welfare. In fact, after having pronounced the pardon of those who were in exile or in prison for political offences; after having erected the *Consulta di Stato*, and instituted the council of ministers; after having granted, through the imperious necessity of circumstances, the institution of the Civic Guard, the new law for a decent liberty of the press, and, lastly, a fundamental statute for the States of Holy Church; he had a good right to that gratitude which is due from subjects to a Prince who regarded them not otherwise than as his children, and who led them to expect no other reign than that of love. But far different was the return he received for the many benefits and acts of condescension which he had lavished upon them. After short demonstrations of applause, directed, however, by those whose bosoms already harboured the most criminal designs (demonstrations, to which the holy father exerted himself to put a stop in a way altogether peculiar to his paternal heart), he very soon experienced the bitter fruit of ingratitude. Forced by the unbridled violence of a faction to involve himself in a war with Austria, he found himself constrained to pronounce an allocution in the Consistory of the 29th day of April of last year, in which he declared to the whole world that his duty and his conscience were not consenting to it. Nothing more was wanted to cause the long-prepared machinations to break forth into open violence done to the exercise of his full and free powers, by compelling him to make a division of the ministry of state into ecclesiastical and civil,—a division which he has never recognised.

"The holy father trusted, however, that, by placing in the different ministries suitable persons and friends of order, matters would take a better course, and that a partial stop would be put to those mischiefs which already threatened great calamities. But a murderous weapon, wielded by the assassin's hand, cut short, by the death of the minister Rossi, the hopes which had been conceived. From that crime, hailed with triumph, the reign of violence shamelessly inaugurated itself; the Quirinal was surrounded by armed men, attempts were made to set it on fire; against the very apartments where the supreme pontiff resided shots were directed, to which he had the grief of seeing one of his secretaries fall a victim; and at last it was intended to force an entrance at the cannon's mouth into his palace, unless he consented to admit the ministry meant to be imposed upon him.

"Having, through a succession of deeds so atrocious, necessarily succumbed to the empire of force, as is well known to all the world, the Pontiff found himself reduced to the hard necessity of removing from Rome, and from the whole Pontifical State, in order to recover the liberty which had been taken from him, and which he must enjoy in the full exercise of his supreme power. Having in the order of Divine Providence repaired to Gaeta, where he was hospitably received by an eminently Catholic prince, and being surrounded by a large portion of the Sacred College, and by the representatives of all the powers with which he is in relations of amity, he did not delay a moment to make his voice heard in announcing, by the Pontifical Act of the 27th November last, the

motives of his temporary separation from his subjects, the nullity and illegality of all the acts which had emanated from a ministry extorted by violence, and in nominating a government commission which should assume the direction of public affairs during his absence from his States.

"Taking no notice of this manifestation of his will, and contriving to elude its force in the eyes of the ignorant multitude by paltry pretences, the authors of these sacrilegious outrages proceeded to greater crimes, arrogating to themselves those rights which belong to the Sovereign alone, by the institution of an illegal representation of government under the title of Provisional and Supreme State Junta. Against this most aggravated and sacrilegious misdeed the holy father solemnly protested by his other act of the 17th December last, declaring that the said State Junta was nothing else but an usurpation of the sovereign power, and was consequently without any authority.

"He expected that these protests would recall the transgressors to the duties of fidelity and allegiance; but, instead of this, a new and still more monstrous act of open felony, and actual rebellion, filled up the cup of his bitterness. This was the convocation of a General National Assembly of the Roman States, for the purpose of framing new political forms to be given to the states of the holy see. Whereupon he protested against that act by another motu proprio of the 1st of January last, condemned it as an enormous and sacrilegious outrage committed against his independence and sovereignty, deserving of the chastisements threatened by divine as well as human law, and prohibited all his subjects from taking any part in the same, warning them, that whosoever ventures to assail the temporal sovereignty of the supreme Roman pontiffs, incurs censures, and especially the major excommunication,—a penalty which he declared that those also had incurred who in any manner, and under any lying pretext whatever, had violated and usurped his authority.

"As for the reception given by the party to this protest and authoritative condemnation, it is sufficient to state that every effort was tried to prevent its promulgation; whoever dared to inform the people of it, or did not second their views, was subjected to punishment; nevertheless, in spite of such unheard-of violence, the majority of the subjects remained faithful to their own Sovereign, and exposed themselves to sacrifices and to perils, even of life itself, rather than be wanting to their duty as subjects and Catholics. Greatly exasperated by seeing their designs obstructed, the said party redoubled, in a thousand ways, violence and terror, without paying any regard to rank or condition, but, being determined at all cost to consummate their excess of felony, they had recourse even to the vilest and most mercenary arts. Thus proceeding from excess to excess, through the abuse of the very benefits granted by the Pontiff, and especially converting the liberty of the press into the most revolting licentiousness, after the most iniquitous malversations, committed in order to reward their accomplices and to rid themselves of the presence of honest and conscientious men, after so

many assassinations committed under their ægis, after having disseminated in every direction rebellion, immorality, and irreligion, after having seduced so many unwary youths, having cast off all respect for sacred places and for the asylums of peace and solitude, and even the places of public instruction, so much so as to convert them into layers for a most undisciplined soldiery, raked together from refugees and common rogues of foreign countries, it is intended to transform the capital of the Catholic world, the seat of the Pontiffs, into a seat of impiety, casting down, if it were possible, every idea of sovereignty in him who is destined by Providence to rule the Universal Church, and who, for the express purpose of a free exercise of his authority over the whole Catholic world, is in possession of a State as the patrimony of the Church; at the sight of which desolation and destruction the Holy Father cannot but be deeply grieved, as well as moved by the cry of his good subjects, who implore his aid and assistance for their deliverance from the most atrocious tyranny.

"His Holiness, as is well known, soon after his arrival in Gaeta on the 4th day of December last, addressed himself to all the Sovereigns with whom he has relations, and informing them of his removal from his capital and from the Pontifical State, and of the causes which had led to it, invoked their protection in defence of the dominions of the Holy See. It is a pleasing satisfaction to be able to declare that almost all responded kindly, showing the most lively sympathy for his sufferings and his painful position, offering themselves ready to support him, and at the same time manifesting the most obsequious feelings of devotion and of attachment.

"While, reckoning upon such happy and generous dispositions, Her Majesty the Queen of Spain had with so much solicitude promoted a Congress of the Catholic Powers for determining the means of promptly restoring the Holy Father to his States, and to his full liberty and independence,—a proposition to which several Catholic Powers had given their adhesion, and that of the rest was expected,—it is a painful duty to report that the affairs of the Pontifical State are a prey to a devastating conflagration through the exertions of the party which aims at the subversion of every social institution, and which, under the specious pretences of nationality and independence, has left no stone unturned to attain to the height of its iniquity. The so-called 'Fundamental' Decree, issued by the Roman Constituent Assembly on the 9th instant, presents an act which, upon every account, teems with the blackest felony and the most abominable impiety. By it the Papacy is declared *de facto* and *de jure* deposed from the temporal government of the Roman State; a republic is proclaimed; and, by another act, the tearing down of the arms of the Holy Father is decreed. His Holiness, thus seeing his supreme dignity as pontiff and sovereign set at nought, protests, before all potentates, and before every individual Catholic in the whole world, against this excess of irreligion, and against so violent an attempt to despoil him of his imprescriptible and most sacred rights. Unless a prompt remedy be applied, the succour will arrive after the States of the

Church, now wholly a prey to its bitterest enemies, shall have been reduced to ashes.

"The Holy Father, therefore, having exhausted all the means at his disposal, urged by the duty incumbent on him before the face of the whole Catholic world to preserve in its integrity the patrimony of the Church, and the sovereignty annexed to it, which is so indispensable for the maintenance of his full liberty and independence as supreme head of the Church itself, and moved, moreover, by the groans of the good, who are loudly calling out for help, being unable to endure the iron yoke and tyrant-hand any longer, turns once more to the same powers, and especially to those Catholic powers which have with so much generosity of mind, and in so unequivocal a manner, manifested their decided willingness to come forward in defence of his cause, well assured that they will with all solicitude concur, by their moral intervention, in his restoration to his see, and to the capital of those dominions which were constituted expressly for the maintenance of his full liberty and independence, and guaranteed moreover by the treaties which form the basis of the European law of nations.

"And, forasmuch as Austria, France, Spain, and the kingdom of the Two Sicilies are, by their geographical position, in a situation which enables them to be readily at hand with their arms, for the restoration, in the dominions of the Holy See, of that order which has been subverted by a band of sectaries, the Holy Father, relying on the religious interest felt by those powers, as children of the Church, demands with full confidence their armed intervention, principally for the deliverance of the State of the Holy See from that faction of wretches, who, by every species of wickedness, exercise in it the most atrocious despotism.

"By this means alone can order be re-established in the States of the Church, and the chief pontiff restored to the free exercise of his supreme authority,—an issue which is imperiously demanded by his sacred and august character, by the interests of the universal Church, and by the peace of nations; and thus will he be enabled to preserve that patrimony which he received at his accession to the pontificate, that he should transmit it entire to his successors. The cause is that of order and of catholicism. Wherefore the Holy Father trusts, that while all the powers with which he is in relations of amity, and which, in the situation into which he has been thrown by a party of factious men, have in so many ways manifested the strongest interest in him, will give a moral assistance to the armed intervention which he has been forced, by the gravity of the circumstances, to invoke, the four powers above mentioned will not delay one moment to render the assistance required of them, thereby deserving well of the cause of public order and religion.

"The undersigned, cardinal pro-secretary of state of his holiness, therefore engages your excellency to have the kindness to bring this note as promptly as possible to the knowledge of your government: and in the confident hope of a favourable reception, he has the honour, &c."

While this document exhibits the political views of the Pa-

pacy, in opposition to those of the Italian democracy, it is worth while to contrast with the deistical creed of Mazzini and his school the religious character in which the Papacy presented itself before the world at this critical moment. At Rome itself a most barefaced attempt was made to get up a reaction in the public mind, by the lying miracle of the handkerchief of St. Veronica, the particulars of which we recorded at the time[9]; and the whole world was filled with appeals to "the Queen of Heaven," as "the sovereign mother of mercy," on whose protection Pius IX. declared that he relied with especial confidence, and whose more particular favour he endeavoured to conciliate by the famous Encyclic on the Immaculate Conception, preparatory to the contemplated promulgation of that fundamental heresy as an article of the faith[1].

The documents which we have transcribed, and those to which, having formerly placed them on record, we have referred our readers, will enable them to form a correct estimate of the character of the two contending parties, more in accordance with the facts of the case than the fallacious picture drawn by the writer in the *Quarterly*. As regards the long catalogue of crimes and barbarities laid to the charge of Mazzini and the rest of the leaders of the revolution in the article to which we allude, we cannot but feel surprised that so respectable a publication should scrape together such a mass of wholesale accusations, without vouchsafing to indicate the authority upon which they rest. To say nothing of the explicit denial of these charges, as applicable to himself, and to the government of which he was a member, which appeared in the public prints both in England and France, at the very moment when the article in question must have been in course of preparation, in a letter addressed by Mazzini to MM. de Tocqueville and de Falloux, the exaggeration and untruth of the representations in the *Quarterly* is apparent from their self-contradictory character. While the writer at one part of his narrative states, with perfect truth, that the civic guard, and the revolted soldiery of Rome, were the parties by whom the cardinals were arrested, the life of Pius endangered, and the whole body of the clerical power driven from Rome, he requires his readers at another part of his story to believe that the great mass of the population of Rome was well affected to the Pope, and that the whole revolution was the work of a small faction, composed chiefly of foreign refugees.

[9] See *English Review*, vol. xi. pp. 236, 237.

[1] See the conclusion of the Rescript of Nov. 27, 1848; *English Review*, vol. x. p. 487; and the Encyclic, vol. xi. pp. 238—240.

If this had been the state of the case, would it, we ask, have been possible for a handful of terrorists to have maintained, not only their own power, but the defence of Rome, for upwards of two months, against the science and superior power of the French army? And why, we would further ask, can the French not venture to quit Rome, nor Pius IX. to enter it, although the "faction," and all its adherents, have long been driven forth into exile, and scattered far and wide over the earth?

We are not concerned to vindicate the character of Mazzini and of his coadjutors, for whose principles we need not say that we feel the utmost abhorrence; but truth, and the interests, not of history only, but of the present course of European diplomacy, require that no false colouring should be given to the facts of the case. The Roman revolution, whatever its character, was essentially the work of the Roman population; its excesses, whatever they might be, the fruit of deep religious and moral depravity, engendered by popish superstition and papal misrule,—deeds of blood perpetrated in the streets in a moment of frantic excitement, the terrible response made by a brutalized populace to bloodier and more cruel deeds perpetrated for ages in the dungeons of the Inquisition. We may, indeed, stand aghast at the spectacle of a conflict which exhibits, to whichever side we look, humanity depraved, and Heaven outraged; but to make use of the iniquities of the one party,—to say nothing now of exaggerations or of false imputations grounded upon facts for which those upon whom they are charged are not responsible,—for the purpose of palliating the iniquities of the other; to attempt to enlist the sympathies of men for a system vicious in its origin, and intolerable in its operation, by painting in the blackest colours the system and the men which have risen up in opposition against it, is a manœuvre unworthy alike of the historian and of the statesman.

But we must not anticipate. Before adverting to the part which other states or nations have acted in reference to the Roman question, let us first of all endeavour to get at an impartial view of the position as it was at Rome itself, and to ascertain to which side right and justice incline, whether to the Papacy, or to the republic by which the Papacy as a temporal power was, for a time at least, supplanted.

Viewing the matter, first of all, politically, how does the case stand between the Papacy and the republic? upon what foundation of political right does the Papacy rest? There are, in all, three foundations upon which, politically speaking, a government may rest: the first, hereditary right; the second, the choice

of the people; the third, admissible only under circumstances of great peculiarity and as an exceptional case, the consent of other powers recorded in solemn treaties. To which of these grounds will the Papacy appeal? Not to the first, because the papal sovereignty is not hereditary, but elective; not to the second, because it is not by the choice of the people, but by that of the College of Cardinals, themselves appointed by the Pope, and many of them foreigners, that the Pope is elected; not to the third, because although the Papacy has been recognised in the successive settlements of Europe, still the Papacy, having recorded a solemn protest against each such settlement [2], cannot possibly prefer any claim of right on the ground of treaties which have by its own voice been declared unlawful and invalid. In any case, it admits of a question, whether the consent of other powers can be binding as between a sovereign and his subjects, whose free consent, or else their admission and belief of the hereditary rights of the sovereign, is essential to the validity of any dominion whatever; but that a sovereign at variance with his subjects cannot appeal, as a ground on which he claims their obedience, to treaties with other powers against which he himself has protested, is abundantly evident.

The conclusion, therefore, is, that the Pope cannot substantiate any *political* right to his sovereignty over the Roman States. This fact alone is sufficient to put the Roman people in the right, in any issue turning upon the question whether or not the Pope shall rule over them and they obey him. So long as they acquiesce in his bearing rule over them, he may have a semblance of authority; but, when the point is raised, the defect in his title becomes at once apparent; and his legitimate rule is at an end the moment his *de facto* subjects take it into their heads that they will no longer own him for their sovereign.

If, on the other hand, it be asked whether or not the government of the Roman Republic was a lawful government, the answer is equally decisive. The Roman government which was overthrown by the arms of General Oudinot had the highest political sanction which any government not derived from hereditary right possibly can have. It was the Government established by the choice of the people,—the fruit of universal suffrage. We are aware that there is a doubt as to the extent to which the right of voting was exercised in the election for the Constituent Assembly; and the *Quarterly* has a strange tale upon this as well as upon most

[2] The extraordinary diplomatic position in which the Papacy has placed itself by its own acts and declarations, is fully discussed in a pamphlet published last year for the National Club by Messrs. Hatchards, under the title, "Papal Diplomacy and the Bull *in Cœnâ Domini*."

other topics. But, even supposing that, from apathy, or from religious scruples arising from the Pope's bull of excommunication, large numbers of electors did not go to the poll,—nay, supposing it proved that the majority took no part in the election,—can this invalidate the election itself? It is not so much as pretended that any violent measures were resorted to, to deter the electors in the interest of Pius from recording their votes. They were free to vote, if they chose; their absence from the poll must under such circumstances be taken as a tacit acquiescence in the decision of the majority of those who voted. There was not at the period of the election in the Roman States any thing like the agitation by which the various elections in France, since the revolution of February, 1848, have been accompanied; and there can be no manner of doubt that the Constituent Assembly, which exercised the sovereign power in Rome from the 9th of February to the 2nd of July, 1849, was as lawfully chosen and constituted as the National Assembly of France; and that the title of Messrs. Lamartine and Co., and afterwards, that of General Cavaignac and M. Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, to the executive power in France was, and is, no better than that of Messrs. Armellini, Mazzini, and Saffi to the triumvirate of Rome.

We beg our readers to bear this point distinctly in mind, that according to the *political* principles recognised by the law of nations Pius never had any right, and on the contrary Armellini, Mazzini, and Saffi had as good a right as, under the circumstances, any one could have, to rule in Rome and over the Roman States.

Upon what, then, is the claim of Pius IX. to the sovereignty of Rome founded? Notoriously, by the evidence of history and by his own confession, upon a religious theory,—upon the theory that the Pope is, as the viceregent of Christ, and the visible head of the Church, invested with supreme authority over all Christendom, and that for the better exercise of this authority a temporal dominion has, in the order of Divine Providence, been assigned to him. Now it is certainly a striking fact that this religious theory, the only solid basis on which the Pope's authority can be made to rest, is denied at Rome itself; that in the very city and state to which this religious theory gives all their importance in the history of modern Europe, the theory, and with it the Pope's sovereignty, is repudiated; and it is difficult to see how, in the teeth of this fact, the theory can be considered as conferring any validity upon the alleged right of the Papacy over the Roman States. The acknowledgment of that theory by the Romans themselves is manifestly an indispensable condition of the existence of any right of sovereignty over them which that theory may be supposed to confer upon the Pope; and, therefore, since the Romans them-

selves have repudiated that right, no other power can, by virtue of its admission of that theory, acquire any right of intervention in the affairs of the Roman States, for the purpose of upholding the repudiated sovereignty of the Pope.

From the same premises some other curious consequences are deducible, which, though we shall have occasion to advert to them more fully hereafter, it will be useful to note down at once in this place, for the completeness of the argument.

The religious theory on which the sovereignty of the Pope is based, we have seen, can give him a right over the Roman people only in the event of their accepting the theory, and not otherwise; it can give to other powers a right of intervention in the affairs of the Roman State, only in the event of the Pope's right being acknowledged by the Romans, and in the further supposition that those powers themselves accept the religious theory. In the absence, on the contrary, of a distinct recognition of that theory on the part of any given power, no right of intervention can possibly belong to that power. France, for example, does not as a state recognise the religious theory in question. The Roman Catholic religion, of which that theory forms a part, or rather to which it exclusively belongs as one of the distinctive features of its doctrinal system, is not the religion of the state of France, but only the religion of the majority of Frenchmen. Consequently France can have no right to interfere for the maintenance of the Pope's sovereignty. Furthermore, if the religious theory on which the Pope's claim to sovereignty over the Roman State is founded, be expressly denied by any power, that power is by that very fact precluded, not only from interfering to uphold the Pope's sovereignty, but from holding any intercourse or communication with him as a sovereign; and, though it may have no direct call to put down a claim which it believes to be founded in falsehood, yet, if ever called upon by circumstances to give an opinion or to take action on the subject, such opinion or action must of necessity be directed upon the abolition of a sovereignty known or believed to be based upon an essentially untrue foundation. This is precisely the case of this country; it is the *rationale* of the laws which prohibit the sovereign and government of these realms from having any diplomatic dealings with the Papacy. The policy of England is to put down the Papacy, even as it is the policy of the Papacy to put down the Church and State of England; and on either side this is not a matter of choice, but of moral necessity. For this country to take any part, direct or indirect, in upholding the Pope's sovereignty over the Roman State, or to recognise that sovereignty by any diplomatic intercourse, is to stultify the national faith, and the established religion of the kingdom, which pro-

nounces the religious theory on which the Papacy is based an untruth, and the sovereignty claimed on the strength of it an usurpation. Lastly, there is one more conclusion, and that an all-important one, which ought not to be lost sight of in the consideration of this question. If that religious theory be actually, as we believe it to be, contrary to God's truth, if it be neither more nor less than an error, a falsehood, and a pretence, what else can we expect but that the papal sovereignty, which is based upon it, will sooner or later be overthrown and crumble in the dust? Unless we embrace the monstrous supposition that God has abdicated His own sovereignty, and His character as a God of truth, we cannot anticipate aught but a terrible downfal for any edifice raised upon a foundation opposed to His truth.

If this reasoning be correct,—and we are at a loss to see upon what ground its validity can be called in question, being in fact the same reasoning by which, starting from opposite premises, the Papacy itself derives its claim,—we are entitled to lay down as incontrovertible the following propositions:—

Politically, the Pope's claim to sovereignty over the Roman states is wholly untenable.

Upon the ground of a religious theory, that claim must be repudiated by those who repudiate the theory; it cannot be supported by those who, without repudiating the theory, do not acknowledge it; it may be supported by those who themselves accept the theory; provided always, that the Roman people, whom the claim affects as the Pope's alleged subjects, accept the theory, and its consequence, the Pope's sovereignty over them.

Applying these general principles to the case in hand, we arrive at the following conclusions:—

When the Roman people,—casting off, from whatever cause or motive, the religious theory in which, as well as in its consequence, the Pope's sovereignty over them, they had hitherto acquiesced, pronounced the deposition of the Pope,—constituted themselves into a republic, and placed at the head of that republic governors of their own choosing, they did that which they had a perfect political right to do, and by this their act they caused the sovereignty of the Pope to become, not only *de facto*, but *de jure* extinct.

The interference of any foreign power whatever, for the purpose of forcing the Pope back upon the Roman people as their sovereign, is, under these circumstances, wholly unjustifiable. If it was not thought that the powers of Europe were called upon or entitled to interfere for the purpose of forcing Charles X. in 1830, or Louis Philippe in 1848, back upon France, there was still less

reason or right to force back Pius upon Rome: for both Charles X. and Louis Philippe had a title to the throne; the former his hereditary right, the latter the choice of the people; both sanctioned by European treaties and international recognition; whereas Pius, as we have seen, had neither.

Had the circumstances been different,—had, for example, a well-ascertained and recognised majority of the Roman people pronounced itself in favour of the Pope's sovereignty over them, and called for protection against an internal faction, or against a foreign invader, it would have been competent for the Roman Catholic powers of Europe, with the tacit or express consent of the rest, to interfere; but even in that case there would have been no room for the interference of France, which, as a state professing no religion, can have no claim or aptitude to interfere in a question the merits of which turn altogether upon points of religious belief.

France, by interposing her armed intervention for the restoration of the Pope, has been guilty of a violation of the law of nations which nothing can justify; she has done that which, although from the peculiar circumstances of the times acquiesced in by the French people and by the other European powers, and —for a time at least, for the end is not yet known—successful, never can lay the foundation for any permanent settlement of the affairs of Rome, and which reflects infinite disgrace upon France, on three distinct grounds:—

1. Because the invasion of the territory of the Roman republic by the French army was an act of unprovoked aggression, considerably aggravated by the relative strength of the two republics.

2. Because for the French republic, established by universal suffrage, to put down the Roman republic, established upon the selfsame basis of universal suffrage, was not only a political error, but a political iniquity; France trampling under foot, in the case of Rome, rights and principles which, in her own case, she had herself quite recently asserted.

3. Because, in a question the merits of which depend entirely on the tenets of a particular faith, France, which as a state has no religious faith whatever, can have neither call nor title to interfere, having no data for determining the object to which her interference ought to be directed.

In addition to these three evident reasons, which rendered the French expedition to Rome necessarily unlawful and improper, France has disgraced herself by the duplicity and perfidy with which the invasion was planned and carried into effect.

When the first proposal was made in the National Assembly of

France to send an expedition to Rome, the official report made to the Assembly by the Commission to which the subject was referred, stated expressly:—

"From the explanations given by the President of the Council, and by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, it has been made evident, that *the idea of the Government is not to make France a party to the overthrow of the Republic actually established at Rome*, but that it acts independently, free from all joint responsibility with other powers, consulting only its own interests, its honour, and the share of influence to which it is necessarily entitled in any European question. Your Commission has recorded these positive declarations.

"Sprung from a popular revolution, *the French Republic could not, without lowering herself, co-operate in the enslavement of an independent nationality.* But it is precisely because Piedmont has succumbed, because the imperial armies threaten Tuscany and the Romagna, by virtue of the laws of war and of the privileges of victory, and because in their train cruel reactions would necessarily take effect, that it is all-important for France,—unless she is prepared to abdicate her position,—to have her flag flying in Italy, in order that under its shadow *humanity may be respected, and liberty be at least partially saved.*

"Your Commission has understood that, in authorizing the executive power to occupy a point in Italy, which is at this moment menaced, you would instruct it to *set a limit to the pretensions of Austria*, and *by an arbitration*, which the force of our arms would support if necessary, to put an end to all the differences by which the peninsula is still divided, and which our interest as well as our honour requires that we should see settled *in a way as favourable as possible for the development of democratic institutions.*"

To this report M. Odilon Barrot, the President of the Council, declared that he gave his hearty assent. "I repeat," he said, "I withdraw not one word of all that I have stated in the commission, and that has been reproduced at this tribune."

Nothing could be plainer than this announcement of the views and intentions of the French government. In this sense the expedition had, according to the political principles of the French republic, a rational and legitimate end. The Roman people had done what the French people had done before them. They had deposed a sovereign who had, as has been before shown, less right to rule at Rome than Louis Philippe had to rule at Paris. They were threatened with a reaction, forcing back upon them their deposed sovereign. This was a declaration of war against the principles on which the existence of the French as well as of the Roman republic depended. If France abstained from interfering to promote republican institutions beyond her frontiers,

she had a reciprocal right to demand that no other power should crush republican institutions beyond its frontiers: she had a right to say to Austria, "If I do not promote the establishment of a republic at Milan, you have no right to oppose the existence of a republic actually established at Rome." Accordingly the French Assembly voted the necessary funds, and the expedition sailed, not, we repeat, for the purpose of re-instating the Pope, but of securing Rome against a possible restoration contemplated in other quarters.

The expedition landed at Civita Vecchia on the 25th of April. On the day preceding a notification was addressed to the President of Civita Vecchia by the aide-de-camp of the commander-in-chief, in which the following passage occurs:—

"The government of the French republic, always animated by a most liberal spirit, declares that *it intends to respect the will of the majority of the Roman populations*, and that it comes upon their territory with a friendly intent, for the purpose of maintaining its legitimate influence. It is, moreover, *thoroughly determined not to impose upon those populations any form of government not chosen by themselves.*"

Had the real intentions of the French government corresponded with its professions, the expedition would have been received with open arms, as an immense accession of strength, by the government of the Roman republic. In fact, the first landing of the French troops at Civita Vecchia was effected without resistance, in consequence of the reliance placed by the municipality of the place upon these declarations. The first appearance of the fleet in the port created an uneasy sensation; but the above manifesto of the French commander soon allayed the excitement, and the troops of the sister republic were greeted as friends and deliverers. The address of the municipality indicates, it is true, a lurking suspicion that all was not as it should be. "If, which was impossible, *their confidence should be betrayed*, they appealed to the judgment of Europe;" but with this exception the address offered to their French "brothers" the "affectionate welcome of a population confiding in the nobleness and the honour of the French nation." It concluded with these words: "Long live the French republic! God save the Roman republic!"

Meanwhile the executive at Rome, better informed, it would appear, of the real policy of the French cabinet, had hastily convened the Assembly, when the following protest was addressed to General Oudinot:—

"The Roman Assembly, surprised by the menace of an invasion of

the territory of the republic, and convinced that this invasion, neither provoked by its conduct towards other nations, nor preceded by any communication on the part of the French government, excites to anarchy a country which, tranquil and well organized, relies on the consciousness of its rights, and on the concord of its citizens; that *it violates at the same time the law of nations, the engagements contracted by the French nation in its Constitution, and the relations of fraternity which ought naturally to link together the two republics*, protests, in the name of God and the people, against this unexpected invasion, proclaims its firm resolve to resist, and holds France responsible for all the consequences."

This protest, drawn up on the very day on which the landing of the French troops was effected, was accompanied by orders to the authorities of Civita Vecchia, to oppose the landing: but these orders arrived too late; under the name of friendship, treacherously assumed, the French had obtained a footing in the Roman territory, and all that the prefect of Civita Vecchia could do was to address to General Oudinot, in reply to a despatch which he had received from him, a protest in the following terms:—

"I have received the despatch by which you inform me that the French government, desirous of putting an end to the situation in which the Roman populations have been placed for some months past, and of facilitating the establishment of an order of things free from the abuses and the anarchy of these last times, has resolved to send a body of troops to Civita Vecchia.

"As representative of the Roman republic, it is my duty to protest against the word 'anarchy,' which is not applicable to a people who, in accordance with their indisputable right, have established for themselves an orderly and moral government; and I can assure you that France is exceedingly ill-informed touching the events which have taken place, and the conduct which we have pursued.

"Force can effect much in this world; but *I cannot persuade myself that the French republic intends to employ its forces for the oppression of the rights of a republic born under the same auspices as herself. Europe, whose eyes are upon us, will judge your acts; and history will tell whether our political conduct is chargeable with anarchy.*

"I am certain that, when you shall have learned the truth, you will be convinced that *in this country the republic is supported by the immense majority of the people.*"

The tenor of this document shows that the notification sent by General Oudinot himself to the prefect was of a less guarded character than that by which his aide-de-camp had lulled the suspicions of the other civil and military authorities of Civita Vecchia. On the day following the landing, the general pub-

lished a proclamation sent with him from Paris, with instructions to publish it in the event of his not meeting with any serious resistance at Rome, but finding himself invited by the wishes of the population. He seems rightly to have judged that, if it was to be published at all, he had no time to lose, and he therefore promulgated it at Civita Vecchia on the 26th.

"Inhabitants of the Roman States! A body of French troops has landed on your territory. *Their object is not to exercise there an oppressive influence, nor to force upon you a government opposed to your own wishes.* On the contrary, they come to preserve you from the greatest calamities.

"The political events of Europe rendered the appearance of a foreign flag in the capital of the Christian world inevitable. The French republic, by conveying its flag thither before any other, gives a *striking testimony of its sympathies with the Roman people.*

"*Receive us as brothers; we shall justify that title.* We shall respect your persons and your property; we shall pay ready money for all our expenditure; *we shall make arrangements with the existing authorities, to prevent our momentary occupation from molesting you in any way; we shall save the military honour of your troops by associating them every where with our own for the maintenance of order and liberty.*

"Romans, my personal devotion is at your service. If you listen to my voice, if you trust my word, I shall consecrate myself unreservedly to the interests of your beautiful country."

The deeds of the general, however, did not correspond with these fair and honeyed promises. As soon as he found that Rome was not prepared to open its gates to him, he took complete military possession of Civita Vecchia, disarmed the Roman garrison, sequestrated a convoy of fire-arms destined for Rome, interdicted all political discussions in the municipality, and carried himself in all respects as an enemy in occupation of a hostile town. The prefect, Manucci, had the courage to remonstrate:—

"The government of Civita Vecchia, immensely surprised at the news of the disarming of the garrison, and the occupation of the fort by a body of French troops, seeks in vain to reconcile these warlike measures with the solemn assurance of friendship, put forth in writing and by proclamation by the commander-in-chief of the expedition, before the face of this city and of all Europe. It yields, but unwillingly, to superior force, and records its protest."

A few days after it was discovered that the prefect, Manucci, continued to correspond with his own government at Rome; his letters were intercepted, and he himself placed under arrest.

While thus at Civita Vecchia the true character of the expedition rapidly developed itself, the triumvirs at Rome adopted measures for the defence of the city, which took the French commander and all Europe by surprise. The same day which brought intelligence of the landing of the French expedition, saw the walls of Rome covered with the following spirited proclamation:—

"A foreign invasion menaces the territory of the Republic. A body of French troops has presented itself at Civita Vecchia.

"Whatever may be their object, the honour of the principle to which the people have freely assented, the law of nations, and the honour of the Roman name, require that the Republic should resist, and the Republic will resist.

"It is important that the people should prove to France, and to Europe, that they are a people not of children, but of men, and that of men who have dictated laws and imparted civilization to Europe. No one must have it in his power to say, 'The Romans would be free, and were not able.' The French nation must, by our resistance, by our declarations, by our attitude, be convinced of our wishes, and of our unalterable determination not again to submit to the government which we have overthrown, and which we abhor.

"This is what the people must prove; and he who should oppose such a determination, dishonours the people and betrays the country.

"The Assembly sits *en permanence*. The triumvirate will do its duty, come what may.

"Order, solemn calmness, concentrated energy! The government watches inexorably over all who should attempt to throw the country into anarchy, or to rise against the Republic.

"Citizens, organize yourselves, group yourselves around us. God and the people, law and force will triumph."

The result of the measures taken by the triumvirate was answerable to the energy displayed. Rome was put into an effective state of defence; and the French general, who expected to proceed upon the *veni*, *vidi*, *vici* principle, was repulsed from the walls of the city, with some loss of men and reputation, and with still greater loss of temper: which latter circumstance there is reason to believe had considerable influence upon all the subsequent transactions between himself and the Republic.

When the news of this unexpected blot upon the glory of the French arms, the just retribution for a signal breach of faith, arrived at Paris, the greatest sensation was created by it, both in the public at large and in the Assembly. The minister was severely cross-examined on the proceedings of the expedition; a commission of inquiry was appointed, which reported to the Assembly that,—

"On comparing the facts disclosed by the despatches with all the announcements made in the Assembly, and with the declarations by

which its vote was determined, the majority of the commission arrived at the conclusion, that the directions given to the expedition were not in conformity with the idea with which it was conceived and accepted."

A resolution was accordingly proposed, and carried by a large majority, to the following effect:—

"The National Assembly invites the government to take without delay the necessary measures to prevent the Italian expedition from being any longer diverted from the purpose which had been assigned to it."

It was this vote of censure upon the acts of the government and of General Oudinot which led to the appointment of M. Lesseps as special envoy to Rome. His instructions were to ascertain the precise state of affairs at Rome, and to take care that the further progress of the expedition should be conducted in conformity with the views of the Assembly. Into the details of the shuffling conduct pursued by the French government towards its own agent we have no inclination to enter, even if our limits did not forbid it. The documents which he has since published for his own justification, are conclusive as to the real purpose with which he was sent by the French ministry. His mission was a mere make-believe, intended to keep matters quiet at Paris; his very instructions seem to have been falsified, for it was proved, at the inquiry before the council of state, that between the copy which he produced, and that which was retained at Paris in the office of the minister, there was an important discrepancy, calculated greatly to mislead him; and his request from Rome that the minister would let him know by a simple "*yes*," or "*no*," by telegraph whether he approved of the policy suggested by him, was left for three weeks unanswered. The ministry left him to negotiate in the dark, while the operations for the attack upon Rome were in progress, and while the state of affairs at Paris rendered delay desirable; and as soon as they felt that they were strong enough to take Rome, and to keep the parties at home in check, they suddenly recalled their envoy, and instructed General Oudinot to force his way into Rome, without further reference to preceding negotiations. Their conduct was simply guided by their own domestic and party necessities, without any reference to the state of affairs at Rome, or any regard to the obligations imposed on them under existing circumstances by the law of nations.

But to return to the Roman republic. The testimony borne by M. Lesseps is highly important as to the attitude of the Roman population, and the character and position of the existing authorities. On his first visit to the city he thus writes to General Oudinot:—

"I find here, at the first blush, the aspect of a population determined to resist; and, setting aside exaggerated calculations, there are at least 25,000 serious combatants to be reckoned upon. If we were to enter Rome by force, we should not merely pass over the corpses of a few foreign adventurers; we should leave on the pavement citizens, shopkeepers, young men of good extraction,—in fact, *all the classes which defend order and society in Paris.*"

Referring to this statement, he says, in the sequel of his narrative:—

"I was acquainted with all the means of defence of the city, and I felt certain that, before we had received reinforcements and a complete siege apparatus, it was impossible for us to take it by storm; that the resistance would be energetic and general. My subsequent stay at Rome only served to confirm me in the opinion which I had expressed on the day of my arrival."

The following are extracts from his note-book on the same subject:—

"The whole city is in arms. Every where there are barricades and means of defence. The resistance will be general.

"The English consul, who has been resident at Rome for thirty years, shows me his despatches to Lord Palmerston. He confirms me in this opinion.

"The captain of an American man-of-war, who has inspected all the works, has declared that it would take at least from 30,000 to 40,000 men to take the city after a regular siege.

"Lord Napier and the captain of the *Bull-Dog* (English war steamer) has, I am told, expressed the same opinion."—*Notes from the 25th to the 29th of May.*

"There is no such thing as an intermediate, moderate, *juste-milieu*, or conservative party, whatever you choose to call it. Neither at present, nor in prospect, can I see a strong party of this kind. It is true that some few individuals, men of personal importance, officers without troops, pretend to represent it; but every policy which shall lean upon them exclusively, will fail. I freely told this to Count Mamiani, who was presented to me by M. de Forbin Fanson.

"I asked him in the first place whether he could be of any use to us, whether he had partisans sufficiently numerous or sufficiently brave to carry the system of conciliation which I had been sent to bring about. He answered in the negative; adding, that he and his party dared not to do any thing, and had no chance of carrying the point by themselves."—*Note of 20th of May.*

On the important question, as to the number of foreigners present at Rome during the siege, the testimony of M. Lesseps is to the following effect:—

"During my time not a single foreigner came to take service at Rome; those who were there before my arrival amounted to a score of Frenchmen, a few Germans, and from 150 to 200 Poles, who expressed to us their anxious wish to leave Rome in case of hostilities on the part of France, and their readiness to suffer themselves to be sent to any place to which we should furnish them the means of proceeding. As for Italians belonging to other states than the Romagna, are they to be considered as strangers to the cause which Rome sustains? At all events, it would be difficult to attribute to 8000 combatants the most important part of the defence of a city which numbered from 25,000 to 30,000 regularly enrolled soldiers, and a whole population in arms, perfectly determined to offer to its aggressors the most energetic resistance."

Another point on which the testimony of M. Lesseps is valuable, and calculated to remove erroneous and unjust impressions, is the character of Mazzini, with reference to whose views M. Lesseps transcribes from his own notes the following memorandum:—

"I suspect Mazzini, a remarkable and highly influential man, of a wish to promote a religious schism; his writings lead to such an apprehension. He has frequent conferences with English travellers, and sees Protestant missionaries of all nations. To endeavour to divert him from these influences, and to persuade him that France, which he mistrusts, must be the sole hope of Italian liberty; to dissuade him from his notions of schism, and, if necessary, to denounce these tendencies to patriots in the Assembly, representing them as treason to the cause of Italian liberty, which must not be separated from Catholicism."

"I hesitate the less," M. Lesseps adds, after transcribing the foregoing passage, "to make known here the opinion which I entertained of Mazzini, with whom I was then in open conflict, as all through the sequel of our negotiations I have had no reason to be otherwise than gratified by his loyalty, and by the moderation of his character, by which he has gained my full esteem. I had at last greatly shaken, if not wholly dispelled, his prejudice against the French government; and now that he has fallen from power, and no doubt seeks an asylum in a foreign land, I am bound to render homage to the nobleness of his sentiments, the sincerity of his principles, his great capacity, his integrity, and courage."

After this testimony to the character of the writer, our readers may not be sorry to peruse a sketch of the situation of Rome in the middle of May last, from the pen of Mazzini himself, in a letter addressed, at his request, to M. Lesseps:—

"You ask me for a few notes on the actual state of the Roman Republic. I will furnish them to you with that frankness which, during a political life of twenty years, has been with me an inviolable rule. We have nothing to hide, nothing to disguise. We have in these last times

been strangely calumniated in Europe; but we have always said to those to whom we were calumniated, Come and see. You are now here, sir, to verify the correctness of the accusations: do so. Your mission may be accomplished with full and entire freedom. We have hailed it with joy, for it is to us a pledge of safety.

"No doubt France does not dispute our right to govern ourselves as we think best, the right to draw forth, so to speak, from the heart of the country the idea which regulates its life, and to make that the basis of our institutions. France can only say to us, 'In recognising your independence, I mean to recognise the free and spontaneous wish of the majority. If it were true that with you a minority overruled the national tendencies, if it were true that the national form of your government was only the capricious notion of a faction substituted for the general opinion, I could not, linked as I am with the European powers, and desirous of peace, see with indifference the peace of Europe perpetually endangered by the outbreaks and the anarchy which must necessarily characterize the rule of a faction.'

"We acknowledge such a right on the part of France, for we believe in the common responsibility of nations for good; but we say, that, *if ever there was a government sprung from the wish of the majority, and sustained by it, ours is that government.*

"The Republic has been planted among us by the will of an Assembly sprung from universal suffrage; it has every where been received with enthusiasm; it has no where met with any opposition; and be pleased to observe, that opposition has never been as easy, as little dangerous, I might almost say as much provoked, not by acts, but by unfavourable circumstances of an exceptional character, in which from its origin it has been placed.

"The country was emerging from a long anarchy of the powers inherent in the innermost organization of the government which has been deposed. The agitations which are inseparable from every great transformation, and which were fomented at the same time by the crises of the Italian question and by the efforts of the retrograde party, had thrown the country into a feverish excitement, which rendered it accessible to every bold attempt, and to every appeal either to feelings of interest or to the passions. We had no army, no coercive power. In consequence of previous dilapidations, our finances were impoverished, exhausted. The religious question was likely, in able and interested hands, to serve as a pretext, with a population endued with grand instincts and aspirations, but very unenlightened.

"And yet, no sooner was the republican principle proclaimed, than order was established, as a first, indisputable fact. The history of the papal government consists of its revolts: under the republic there has not been a single riot. The assassination of M. Rossi, a deplorable but isolated fact, an individual crime, repudiated and condemned by every body, perhaps provoked by imprudent conduct, the source of which is to this day unknown, was followed by the most complete order.

"The financial crisis reached its height. There was a moment at which the paper of the republic was, through unworthy machinations, negotiable only at 41 or 42 per cent. The attitude of the Italian and European governments became daily more hostile. Both material difficulties and political isolation, all were endured by the people with calmness. They had faith in the future, expected to result from the new principle which had been proclaimed.

"In consequence of dark menaces, but above all through the want of political habits, a certain number of the electors had taken no part in the constitution of the Assembly. This fact appeared to weaken the expression of the general wish. A second characteristic and vital fact gave an unanswerable reply to any doubts which might have prevailed. Shortly before the installation of the Triumvirate, there was a re-election of the municipalities. Every body voted. Every where and at all times the municipal element represents the conservative element in the state. With us there was a momentary apprehension, lest it should represent a retrograde element. Well! the storm had burst; the intervention was commenced: it might have been thought that the republic had only a few more days to live; and that very moment was selected by the municipalities for giving in their spontaneous adhesion to the form of government which had been chosen. During the first fortnight of this month, the addresses of all the municipalities, with two or three exceptions, were added to those of the circles and of the divisions of the national guard. I had the honour of transmitting to you the list of them. They all proclaim an explicit devotion to the republic, and a profound conviction that the union of both the powers on one head is impracticable. This, I repeat, is a decisive fact. It is a second legal trial, which, in the most absolute manner, completes the first, and attests our right.

"At this moment, in spite of the French, Austrian, and Neapolitan invasions, our finances are improved, our credit is rising again, our paper is discounted at twelve per cent; our army increases greatly, and the whole of our population is ready to rise in its rear. You see Rome, and you know the heroic struggle sustained by Bologna. I write this in the night, amidst the most profound tranquillity. And before the arrival of new troops at midnight, our gates, our walls and barricades, were lined by the people in arms, by means of a simple password, without noise or display.

"At the heart's core of this people there is a deeply settled resolve: the abolition of the temporal power vested in the Pope; the hatred of priestly government, under whatever aspect, in however mitigated or indirect a form it may present itself,—hatred, I mean, not of the men, but of the government. Towards individuals our people have, thank Heaven! shown themselves generous ever since the inauguration of the republic; but the bare idea of clerical government, of the king-pontiff, made them shudder. They will struggle desperately against any project of restoration; they will throw themselves into the arms of schism rather than submit to it.

"When the two questions were brought before the Assembly, there were some timid members who thought the proclamation of the republic premature, and dangerous in the presence of the actual organization of Europe; but not a single vote was given against the act of deposition: the right and the left mingled together. There was but one cry, 'The temporal power of the Papacy is for ever abolished.'

"What is to be done with such a people? Can any free government arrogate to itself without crime and self-contradiction the right of forcing upon it a return to the past?

"Return to the past, please to remember, is organized disorder; it is the revival of the struggle of the secret societies; it is anarchy flung into the centre of Italy; it is reaction and vengeance engrafted upon the heart of a people which desires only to forget; it is a permanent torch of war thrown into the midst of Europe; it is the progress of extreme parties displacing the orderly republican government of which we are at present the organ.

"France cannot intend this, nor can her government, nor a nephew of Napoleon, especially not with the double invasion of Neapolitans and Austrians before their eyes. The pursuit of a hostile design at this time of day would have a tendency to remind people of the hideous combination of 1772 against Poland.

"At the same time, it would be impossible to carry it out with effect; for the flag which has fallen by the will of the people, could be raised again only over heaps of corpses, and over the ruins of our cities."

To these statements of M. Mazzini we cannot forbear adding the following memoranda of M. Lesseps himself, as to the probable result of a forcible occupation of Rome. It is dated May the 20th:—

"Every body at Rome is agreed to repel the clerical administration.

"If we mean to occupy Rome by force before we obtain from the Pope an explicit declaration on this subject, we shall only embarrass ourselves. That our soldiers will overcome the material obstacles is certain: but this is the least of our difficulties. *When we shall have entered Rome, after having overthrown the Republic, most assuredly the Holy Father will refuse to come back on such terms as we may see fit to impose upon him. On this side there is an absolute principle which knows of no compromise.* M. de Harcourt agreed with me in this opinion at our very first conference. He told us *he had given up all hope of obtaining any thing at Gaeta.* On the other side there is likewise an absolute principle of a contrary character. *It is only under the pressure of our forces that any ecclesiastical power, however temperate, will be submitted to.* We shall have to maintain a permanent occupation, in order not only to uphold the restoration which our arms will have planted, but to restrain the manifestations of public opinion which will become daily more hostile to the temporal power.

"We shall therefore in the end lose our influence over all parties, that is to say, we shall make for a result diametrically opposed to that which suggested the motive for our expedition. Our exertions and our expedition will only have served to unite against us all the passions of Italy."

Six months have elapsed since the negotiations in which M. Lesseps took so active a part were abruptly broken off by the refusal of General Oudinot to recognise the convention agreed upon between him and the Triumvirate on the 31st of May. The sudden and unjustifiable attack made upon Rome, in consequence of this rupture, terminated, as M. Lesseps foresaw, in the fall of Rome before the superior power of the French forces. But the rest of his prognostication has likewise been fulfilled. The French army is still at Rome, and the Roman population is as determined as ever to resist the restoration of the ecclesiastical government in the Pontifical States. The Pope, on the contrary, refuses to be dictated to by France, and the Papacy continues—who shall tell for how long—in exile.

Before we close this article, we must not omit to notice a fact which concerns us more nearly than any of the events and circumstances which have hitherto occupied our attention. We have found fault with the French government, because as a republican government, professing no religion, it undertook the restoration of the Pope, whose sovereignty has, as we have seen, no political basis, but rests entirely upon a religious theory not recognised by the constitution of the French republic. But what shall we say to the conduct of the Government of Great Britain, which is pledged by the coronation oath of the Sovereign, and by the oath of supremacy of the servants of the Crown, to repudiate the religious theory whereon the sovereignty of the Papacy over the Roman State is founded, as diametrically opposed to the truth of God, and which nevertheless officially recognises that sovereignty, together with its untrue foundation? We abstain from all comment upon the following facts, which are disclosed in the "Correspondence respecting the affairs of Rome," and which deserve to be generally known.

1. In the month of January last Her Majesty Queen Victoria *addressed to the Pope* a letter expressive of her interest and sympathy with his position. See the letter of the Pope's nuncio addressed to Lord Normanby, in which Her Majesty's letter is referred to. *Correspondence*, p. 8.

2. The British Secretary for Foreign Affairs *is in constant diplomatic communication with Rome*, not only indirectly through an English papist, who is the resident diplomatic agent at Rome, and forwards his despatches through the medium of the

British envoy at Florence, but directly by regular diplomatic communications between the British ambassador and the Pope's nuncio at Paris, between whom despatches are exchanged upon the same footing of mutual recognition as between any other diplomatic characters. The following documents clearly establish this fact :—

"*Paris, March* 8, 1849.

"My Lord,—I have the honour to transmit the copy of *a note I have received from the Apostolic Nuncio*, inclosing one which has been *addressed by the Cardinal Antonelli to the Representatives of all friendly Powers*, requesting them to co-operate for the purpose of *re-establishing the papal authority at Rome.—The Marquis of Normanby to Viscount Palmerston, with inclosure. Correspondence*, pp. 7. 14.

"*Foreign Office, March* 27, 1849.

"My Lord,—I have received your excellency's despatch of the 8th instant, transmitting to me the copy of a note which your excellency had received from the Apostolic Nuncio, inclosing the copy of the note which has been addressed by Cardinal Antonelli to the Representatives of all friendly Powers, requesting them to co-operate for the purpose of re-establishing the papal authority at Rome.

"I have to instruct your excellency to *say to the Nuncio that Her Majesty's Government have received and have attentively considered the communication which he has made to them through your excellency*, and that you are instructed to express to him the deep regret with which Her Majesty's Government have witnessed the differences which have arisen between the Pope and his subjects, the assassination of Count Rossi, the departure of the Pope from his capital and states, and the proclamation of a republic at Rome.

"The British Government is for many obvious reasons not desirous of taking an active part in any negotiations which may result from the application which the Pope has addressed to some of the Catholic powers of Europe, whose territories are nearer than Great Britain in geographical proximity to the Italian Peninsula. But *the British Government will be much gratified if the result of those negotiations should be such a reconciliation between the Pope and his subjects as might enable the former*, with the free good-will and consent of the latter, to return to his capital, and there *to resume his spiritual functions and his temporal authority*." —*Viscount Palmerston to the Marquis of Normanby. Correspondence*, p. 14.

3. The British Secretary for Foreign Affairs distinctly recognises *the spiritual supremacy of the Pope*, and, as a necessary consequence of it, his temporal sovereignty over the Roman States, and in such recognition makes special reference to the Pope's authority over a large portion of Her Majesty's subjects. Of this, also, we have documentary evidence :—

"*Foreign Office, January* 5, 1849.

"In regard to the present position of the Pope, I have to observe, that no doubt it is obviously desirable that *a person who in his spiritual capacity has great and extensive influence* over the internal affairs of most of the countries in Europe, should be in such a position of independence as not to be liable to be used by any one European power as a political instrument for the annoyance of any other power; and in this view *it is much to be wished that the Pope should be sovereign of a territory of his own*."—*Viscount Palmerston to the Marquis of Normanby. Correspondence*, p. 3.

"*Foreign Office, March* 9, 1849.

"Although Great Britain has not so direct an interest as France has in the ecclesiastical and political questions which arise out of the present relations between the Pope and the people of the Roman States, the British Government, nevertheless, cannot view those matters with indifference. Great Britain is indeed a Protestant state, but *Her Majesty has many millions of Catholic subjects; and the British Government must therefore be desirous*, WITH A VIEW TO BRITISH INTERESTS, *that the Pope should be placed in such a temporal position as to be able to act with entire independence in the exercise of his spiritual functions*."—*Viscount Palmerston to the Marquis of Normanby. Correspondence*, p. 6.

Where are we? and whither are we tending?

Art. VII.—*The Saint's Tragedy; or, The True Story of Elizabeth of Hungary, Landgravine of Thuringia, Saint of the Romish Calendar. By* Charles Kingsley, Junior, *Rector of Eversley, with a Preface by Professor* Maurice. London: John W. Parker, West Strand. 1848.

So many are the "Shams" of this age, the would-be Prophets, ushered into the world with a trumpet-blast of mighty expectation, who prove, after all, to be mere dust and ashes, like the meanest of their forefathers, that we approached the work before us with its quaint and ambitious title and mystic preface, with no slight internal misgivings. We were not inclined to honour the impress of "Professor Maurice" with any indiscriminating act of homage; and we were exceedingly disposed to question the good taste of the poet, who should desire to be thus vulgarly patronized by a contemporary, somewhat better known than himself. Having perused the work before us, and convinced ourselves that it contains much which is both beautiful and valuable, our opinion remains unshaken, that the publication of this said preface "by Professor Maurice," is a very gratuitous act of pomposity, answering no end whatever, save the creation of an unavoidable prejudice, in the first place, against the bard, who could thus seek for a Professor's "*Imprimatur.*"

We can well understand the editing of works of a religious character, whether devotional or controversial, by men long known to the public, whose names form a primary guarantee, at least, that the works in question will contain nothing heretical or positively injurious; but in the case of a dramatic poem like the one before us, we must altogether question the propriety of even such a course. But far more objectionable than such an editorship, which implies the withholding of the author's name for a time (sometimes a desirable and even unavoidable expedient, though this should be resorted to with caution), is the publication of a literary testimony of this nature, which appears to imply a degree of servility on the one side, and of vanity on the other, neither of which are to be tolerated. We are constrained to ask, in this instance, in what character Professor Maurice wishes to appear? whether as an orthodox theologian, commending this publication to the faithful, "more Episcoporum?" or as a critic, deeply versed in poetical literature, and pronouncing "ex Cathedra,"

a favourable judgment, which may guide the opinions of the general public? In either case, we cannot but stand in some doubt as to whether Professor Maurice's literary or theological attainments have placed him on any such eminence as this. We know him as a misty, well-meaning, self-contradictory thinker, oppressed with a vague desire for *Liberty*, to be attained "à tout prix," by every sacrifice, if needful; and we cannot conceive that any portion of the public, beyond a certain knot of gaping "youngsters," —very "good fellows" in their way perchance, but not singularly wise or sober, would be willing to accept Professor Maurice as an infallible exponent of the Faith. We suspect that the general body of readers would look on a poem with increased suspicion, rather than with more hearty confidence, in a religious point of view, if ushered into the world under the especial patronage of Professor Maurice. As for his literary and critical attainments, these are decidedly more than questionable: a vague thinker and talker, like our good Professor, was never fashioned for a critic. We give him all credit for kindness of heart and nobility of disposition; but, unfortunately, clearness of intellect is here the one thing needful, and *that* the Professor does not possess. Amusing instances of his "random flashes" may be discovered in this very preface, in which, for instance, he comments on the essentially-dramatic character of Milton's "Paradise Lost," which is no more dramatic, as we need scarcely say, than every epic needs must be, which sets forth some great conflict as its theme, and which, if any one character were to be appropriated to it, might, with equal justice, be designated "descriptive," or "narrative," or "didactic;" but, in truth, the calm dignity of Milton, whose individual idiosyncracy is apparent throughout all his works, may be said to be essentially opposed to the genius of the drama, which is more or less demonstrative and passionate. Milton's greatness, indeed, enabled him to excel in every thing which he attempted, but he never did essay the portraiture of the passions, which is the drama's peculiar domain.

Of a like airy and unsubstantial hue with this eulogium of Milton's dramatic genius are almost all the utterances of this preface; words, very fine words indeed, but unhappily not much beside. Here is a characteristic sentence. "Whether poetry is again to *revive* among us" (Tennyson and Keble stand for nought, it should seem), "or whether the power is to be wholly stifled *by our accurate notions* about the laws and conditions under which it is to be exercised" ("*teste*," we presume, Carlyle, and Emerson, and Professor Maurice), "is a question upon which there is room for great differences of opinion." (As usual, a wholesome latitude of thought! On what is there *not* such room,

according to the Professor's judgment?) "Judging from the past, I should suppose, that till poetry becomes less self-conscious, less self-concentrated, more *dramatical* in spirit, if not in form, it will not have the qualities which can powerfully affect Englishmen." What does Professor Maurice say, then, to the intense popularity of Byron for so many years? Was not *he* self-conscious? On the contrary, we affirm, a poet who writes about self, will almost always be the most vulgarly popular: he is the most easily appreciable, and he will generally, for awhile at least, command far more attention than the *dramatic* bard, who does not incessantly harp upon one string, but is, like nature's self, impartial. One reason for this is, that the sympathetic reader often places himself in the position of a self-idolater like Byron, and feels his vanity flattered by supposing himself elevated above "the sordid mass" with the poet.

The truth is, that it is more difficult rightly to appreciate a great dramatic work than any other: most people look for fine speeches and fine thoughts in plays,—images, and so forth,—and think little or nothing of dramatic fitness, and the truth and reality of the passions exemplified. Not one man in a thousand reads "Shakspeare" for his real dramatic qualities, or understands them, though every body is prepared to admire and quote his so-called "beauties," things which belong to him rather as a poet, than as the greatest of dramatists. The mingled rage and love of "Lear," subsiding gradually into madness, and forming the most terribly affecting of all mere human portraitures, is far less celebrated than Hamlet's shallow "To be, or not to be,"—shallow, that is, in its morbid Germanism, yet equally admirable in a dramatic point of view, as an exponent of the characterless Teutonic "Hamlet." People understood so little about the drama, that this last sentence of ours must be to the majority "a mystery and the marvel:" they cannot comprehend how a thing can be good and bad at the same time, philosophically false, and yet dramatically admirable. They are so *real*, that they cannot look at any thing *objectively*, and "in the concrete;" and, therefore, the drama is to them a sealed book.

Believing this, we dispute Professor Maurice's dictum, that poetry must become more dramatic to gain any hold on the mind of the nation: it must become more real, and honest, and true: it must discard affectation and foreign "isms" of all sorts; it must come from the heart, and speak to the heart. And it is because Mr. Tennyson's poetry does this in no small degree, that it is so popular as it is: we allude more especially to his "Minor Poems," his "May-Queen," and "Miller's Daughter," and "Lord of Burleigh," and "Lady Clare," which, *when under-*

stood, must always awaken a sympathetic thrill of delight. But dramatic genius of the higher order is so far from commanding popularity, that it is rather a bar to it: it is too abrupt, too passionate, too apparently unsystematic: people don't know what to make of it. They feel frightened, and puzzled too. This acounts for the comparative unconsciousness of the rare gifts of a contemporary, "Browning," which still exists among us. If "Taylor" has achieved a real success with his "Philip van Artevelde," that is rather because it is so eminently *undramatic*, so void of passion, so "didactic." The fame of this production, one of the most prosaic (be it said in all charity) of all metrical contributions to literature, is a standing proof of the almost total absence of appreciation for the drama in the present English public. Readers do not seek for real dramatic utterances, for the inner life of characters in action, such as they would find in "Browning" for instance, but for set speeches, "striking thoughts," "fine ideas," and so forth: that is, for essays in a dramatic form, and not for dramatic poems.

And what holds good, we are sorry to say it, of the general reader (of course, with many exceptions), is still more strikingly exemplified in the judgments of the critics of the day, almost with no exceptions at all. Thus "Quarterly" and "Edinburgh" have striven which should lavish the most enthusiastic praises on such a still-born child, such a dead-alive "Mach-werk," (as the Germans say), as this same Mr. Taylor's "Edward the Fair;" while the organ of northern wisdom has lately devoted an article, of some fifty pages, to such an elaborate mistake (we can use no milder phrase) as Bulwer's "King Arthur." The mention of this poem, as it is not dramatic, might seem "out of keeping" with our theme; but the same love for the false and the artificial, the same preference of a metrical "Talkification" on any theme to a real living creation, is exemplified in this instance. Some day or other, we purpose to immolate both "Philip van Artevelde," that embodiment of pains-taking *laudable* mediocrity, and the unfortunately laborious, and tediously artificial "King Arthur," and the far more obnoxious "Festus," so audaciously magnificent in its *pretensions*, so small and so barbarous in its *performance*, with various other offenders, at the shrine of poetical justice. For the present, however, we must revert to our original theme; and, leaving Professor Maurice and his unlucky preface behind us (on which we are tempted to say much more respecting Germany's "having a right to claim the whole realm of the abstract,"—Query, *the Inane?* &c. &c.), we pass to Mr. Kingsley's poem, which has really merits of a high order, and must secure its author's fame. It is far from being free from faults;

the poet says, in his own definite and sensible preface, that he is painfully aware of them. These faults are exaggeration, overstrained boldness verging upon coarseness, a tendency to bitterness and apparent want of "love," and an occasional burst of "fine talk," strained and stilted, reminding us that the bard has not wholly soared above "the spirit of his age," and reached the sphere of reality and truth. But that Mr. Kingsley *is* a poet who can question, who reads the magnificent "Proem," which we shall transcribe for our readers' edification? There are two imaginary speakers, the man of feeling and the man of action, Epimetheus and Prometheus, the past and the present. First speaks "Epimetheus." (The italics are our own.)

> "Wake again, Teutonic Father-ages,
> Speak again, beloved primæval creeds;
> *Flash ancestral spirit from your pages,*
> *Wake the greedy age to noble deeds.*
>
> "Tell us, how of old our saintly mothers
> School'd themselves by vigil, fast, and prayer;
> Learnt to love, as Jesus loved before them,
> While they bore the cross which poor men bear.
>
> "Tell us, how our stout crusading fathers
> Fought and died for God, and not for gold:
> Let their love, their faith, their boyish daring,
> Distance-mellow'd, gild the days of old.
>
> "Tell us, how the sexless workers, thronging,
> Angel-tended, round the convent doors,
> Wrought to Christian faith and holy order,
> *Savage hearts alike, and barren moors.*
>
> "Ye who built the churches where we worship,
> Ye who framed the laws by which we move,
> *Fathers, long belied, and long forsaken,*
> *Oh! forgive the children of your love!*"

How beautiful is the self-abandonment, the inspired worship, as it were, breathed in these lines! The very rhythm is most happily suggestive; and yet it is used with equal effect in the reply of Prometheus, the man of action, the spirit of the present. He says, then, also addressing our forefathers:—

> "Speak! but ask us not to be as *ye* were!
> *All but God is changing day by day.*
> He, who breathes on man the plastic spirit,
> Bids us mould *ourselves* its robe of clay.

" Old anarchic floods of revolution,
Drowning ill and good alike in night,
Sink, and bare the wrecks of ancient labour,
Fossil-teeming, to the searching light.

" There will *we* find laws, which shall interpret,
Through the simpler past, existing life;
Delving up from mines and fairy caverns,
Charmed blades, to cut the ages' strife.

" What though fogs may steam from draining waters?
We will till your clays to mellow loam,
Till the graveyard of our father's spirits
Sparkle round us into fruitful bloom.

" Old decays but foster new creations;
Bones and ashes feed the golden corn:
Fresh elixirs wander every moment
Down the veins through which the live past feeds
its child, the live unborn."

These very grand lines (despite the presence of some little Germanism,) must speak for themselves. They express the purpose of our author, which is to separate the good from the evil in the Middle Age World; but more especially to stigmatize that false asceticism, which confounded the use and the abuse, and which still threatens to lead many good and noble hearts astray. In this undertaking we can only wish Mr. Kingsley God speed; but then we must aver, that this is a work to be undertaken with all possible care, in a spirit of deep reverence and of love. We will not affirm that this has *not* been the case with the author of "The Saint's Tragedy;" but we do think that he has been injudicious in various respects; that he has written, so as necessarily to repel many, whose sympathies and judgments he must be most anxious to gain,—that is, if he be the man for which we wish to take him, a real lover of his brethren, and a defender of "the truth." We refer more especially to those passages in which he has placed cold-blooded affirmations of horrors, which we regard rather as the extravagant aberrations of asceticism, than as its deliberate "dicta," on the lips of its most intellectual representative, "Conrad," the monk of Marpurg. He is made to speak to the youthful Lewis (see pp. 49 and 50), in a strain of morbid and blasphemous passion, which is positively frightful, which must shock the most favourable reader (we should say), and excite the bitterest indignation in very many. Be it admitted that Romish ascetics have used, are in the habit of using, such language

(though we think full proof of this should be provided, before it is attributed to them): surely, even in that case, such utterances can only be the brainsick wanderings of unhappy devotees in certain stages of religious madness. Such could not be the sober language of a man like Conrad of Marpurg, calm, self-contained, earnest, endeavouring to possess a princely youth with a sense of his order's holiness. Take, "exampli gratia:"—

> "If world-wide lore
> Shall please thee, and the Cherub's glance of fire,
> Let *Catharine* lift thy rapt soul, and with her
> Question the mighty dead, until thou float
> *Tranced on the ethereal ocean of her spirit.*
> *If pity father passion in thee,—hang*
> *Above Eulalia's tortured loveliness!*" &c.

And "worse remains behind," anent "the Magdalen," and even "the Blessed Virgin!" Now this does seem to us too monstrous to be real. We have no doubt that some such language, and even worse (ay, respecting our adorable Lord and Saviour), *may* be discovered in Romish hagiologies, but always, surely, as the fervent aspirations, the outpourings in moments of the intensest enthusiasm, of these unhappy victims of a false asceticism. Can they be found stated in sober earnest, in philosophic talk, as *inducements* to a young man to become a member of an ascetic order? We know not how to believe it. And even if we did so, we should still consider our author *injudicious* in thus abruptly bringing these things before our eyes. His is not "a lady's book," we know; but it is written for Christians, and some regard should have been evidenced for their feelings. We are not "thin-skinned;" but there must be some limit to the reproduction of even actual monstrosities. Besides, we shall not combat false asceticism by confounding it with these excesses and holding up these to horror and contempt: rather must we seek for its most beautiful ideal, and show that even this is faulty. Mr. Kingsley will tell us that he has done this in his heroine "Elizabeth of Hungary," the margravine of Thuringia, as our readers, no doubt, know, a saint of the Roman calendar, dating from the thirteenth century; a happy wife and mother, whose existence was marred and blighted by her hapless confusion of the use with the abuse. Elizabeth, however, as Mr. Kingsley has depicted her, and as we believe she was, had too vehement and passionate a nature to assimilate with our conception of ideal asceticism, whether false or true. And here let us be permitted to state that we do recognise such a thing as true asceticism, rightly understood and guarded: that lifelong abstinence in some

things, though not intrinsically higher and holier than Use; (to affirm this were, in our opinion, gnostic and anti-scriptural,) may yet be more expedient under certain circumstances, as St. Paul tells us, and as our Saviour also intimates. He who ignores this altogether cannot satisfactorily refute the aberrations of asceticism. We should fear that Mr. Kingsley would rather despise, for instance, the keeping of the Church's fasts: but, perhaps, we may do him injustice on this head. Self-denial he, no doubt, nominally advocates; (who would not?) but self-denial without discipline is liable to become another form of selfishness. We admit that self-denial, on the other hand, in obedience to an iron external rule excluding from the lawful use of this world, may also be self-indulgence in a sense, and is distinctly anti-Christian. Mr. Kingsley's primary assumption is sound, that the use of this world in Christ is a holy thing, that old things have passed away, that all has become new, that family affections are now almost or quite a sacrament; but then, admitting all this, it may be still true of individuals, that they may *personally* be bound, to abstain from these holy joys, "to make themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake." Here conscience only can guide each man, and "no man intermeddleth with his brother." We need not say that those who have once entered the holy state of matrimony, would greatly sin, in our opinion, in desiring to quit it; that they would be fearfully erroneous in their notions, if they imagined celibacy to be necessarily "a higher state." All such distinctions we repudiate as uncatholic and unchristian; but still we do not see why a place should not be found for the ascetic life within the Christian Church. Whether it is desirable or no to have *orders* for that purpose is a most difficult question, on which very much can be urged on either side, and which we cannot profess to answer here. We only wish to intimate to Mr. Kingsley that, in our opinion, he has understated the ascetic argument, and overstated the ascetic aberrations, and has in so far injured his own good cause. Still we are ready to do battle with him in behalf of this thesis, that the use of this world is a holy thing in Christ; and thus it is only in a guarded sense and making various allowances, that we can fully sympathize with the religious philosophy of a "Thomas à Kempis:" yet there *is* a sense in which this world and its use are most dangerous to us; there is a sense in which, father, mother, wife, and children must be hated, *if needful*, for Christ's sake; that is, must be abandoned rather than that we should deny "the Lord who bought us."

But to the poem or play itself, on the bearings of which we may not further dilate. The perusal of a single scene convinced us that Mr. Kingsley has real dramatic genius. This is not the

dull, hard, laborious *versifying* of a "Taylor," nor the vain inflation and artificial would-be terseness of a "Bulwer" (in his plays and poems), nor the *savage*, unartistic, unshapely, blasphemous extravagance of a "Bailey;" (we know not how to speak more tolerantly of this gentleman's "Festus," with all its imaginary *power*, which is only "*bigness*," and irreverential audacity, and an exhaustless flux of words, words, words!); no: we have here artistic purpose, dramatic truth, even rhythmical beauty: we are dealing with a poet, not a wordmonger; a dramatist, not a stringer together of sayings in an artificial form. (How naïve and how characteristic was Mr. Taylor's confession in the preface to his recent volume of highly respectable common-place, entitled "Essays," that they appeared in that form, because he had not time *to work up the thoughts into plays or dramatic poems!* "Risum teneatis, amici?")

To fit each of these productions with an image: "Festus" is like a gigantic river-course, which gives promise, viewed from some little distance, of a second Nile or Danube; but, coming a little nearer, we ascertain that this broadest of channels is choked up with miry slime, a boundless bog, where nothing but gigantic reeds can flourish or ugly reptiles crawl:—"King Arthur," on the other hand, resembles an extremely neat canal, adorned with rows of pollards on either hand, interspersed with little bastard Grecian temples and artificial little statues of Cupid and the Graces,—all meant to be exceedingly classical, but really rather "Chinese:"—"Philip van Artevelde," again, is a highly respectable *pump*, rather dry, to be sure; and the water that *does* come from it is a little brackish, but still *most* respectable! (or if you prefer the image of a farmyard pond, with a multitude of ducks quacking about it, and fancying themselves swans, we have no objection:)—while we may liken our "Saint's Tragedy" to a fresh and copious fountain, issuing from a lofty, if a barren crag, and flowing ofttimes in gloom, or bounding in wrath down the steeps,—whose waters, be it added, are not devoid of bitterness.

Sometimes we catch Shakspearian echoes, not in thought, but in expression, in this work of Mr. Kingsley's; but this is only in the prose passages, which are very clever, of their kind, though essentially negative, sarcastic, and bitter, breathing a widely different spirit from Shakspeare's genial philosophy and almost universal benevolence. The bard of Avon's poetic sky is one of azure and bright gold, almost boundless in horizon. Mr. Kingsley's strain reminds us of a narrow strip of heaven, seen between two overhanging mountains, dark and scowling with the promise of the coming storm; and yet there is beauty in such a scene,—wild and lovely mountain flowers spring here and there among the

fissures of the crags, and the wind wails musically from afar. But we are waxing too romantic. Back, then, to our immediate theme!

In Mr. Kingsley's *poetry* we sometimes fancy that we trace something of "Browning's" manner; indeed, if we are not much mistaken, the former is well acquainted with that great poet's works. On the whole, however, our author must be allowed to possess a style of his own, trenchant, vigorous, manly, rather deficient in pathos and in softer qualities, and a little bizarre, given to "starts," and apt to be "in extremes."

All the principal characters, however, are definitely conceived and executed: though "Elizabeth's" nature is too vehemently passionate to answer *our* ideal of female loveliness. All her emotions are so strong from the beginning, that the extreme of her asceticism seems only a fitting pendant to the rest; and does not excite that pity, which our author would desire it to do, if we comprehend him rightly. All her feelings and actions are *noble*, but there is a certain self-will, a certain secret pride, observable in them, which takes from the *amiability* of the portraiture, and prevents our ever sympathizing with her thoroughly. There is an amount of stubbornness in her very piety, natural, we admit, to "Romish sanctity," but also in itself displeasing, and sufficing to account in some degree for the general dislike felt for her by the retainers of the Court, and even, as it should seem, by the very poor whom she benefits. She never wins hearts, save those of her husband, her nurse, and perhaps "Walter of Varila." Indeed we should observe that all Mr. Kingsley's characters are too much given to complaining. Lewis, the husband, is very naturally depictured; a kind and gentle, and in some respects even an heroic nature, dowered with a common-place intellect: thus, necessarily, a man of his own age, sharing all its favourite sentiments and opinions; yet one, who under better auspices might have achieved great things, being the possessor of a noble heart. We thought, at first, he was made to talk too finely—too scholastically—expecting from Mr. Kingsley's preface, a rough-hewn knight of the Middle Ages; but he is *self-consistent* throughout; and precisely answers to what *we* mean in every-day life, when we say, "What a very *nice man!*" The nurse is a very happy portraiture, a little rough, and matter-of-fact, and vulgar, but none the less real for that, and redeemed by her affection for Elizabeth. "Walter of Varila," of whom the author tells us that he represents the healthy animalism of the Teutonic mind (of which we are sorry to say there is not much left,—"experientia docet"—), "with its mixture of deep earnestness and hearty merriment," is exceedingly graphically pourtrayed, and cannot but be a favourite with most readers, we should suppose, and yet he too has his good share of bitterness.

The most doubtful creation in the book, in our opinion, is that of "Conrad of Marpurg," a kind of "implicit apology," Mr. Kingsley says, "for the feelings of such truly great men as Dunstan, Becket, and Dominic," and certainly a far nearer approach to what is aimed at, than the shadowy and poverty-stricken "Dunstan" of Mr. Taylor's "Edwin the Fair." It is very difficult to enter into the real mind and heart of any one of these great founders and supporters of asceticism; and perhaps Mr. Kingsley has come as near the mark as any man before him; though we think he has given an unnecessary coarseness to his portraiture in various particulars. Indeed, to tell the truth, there is something like a tendency to coarseness in Mr. Kingsley. We do not quarrel with him for grappling with his theme manfully; for blurting out some truths which others might leave untold: this may be wise and proper: but he seems to us unable to divest himself of the notion, that asceticism *must be* sensual; and surely this is a gross error. It too often is, no doubt; but is it quite fair to profess to give us its ideal, as our author certainly does in the proem already quoted, and then yield us only its saddest realities, and these *alone*, with nothing to counterpoise them? Is not this proving too much, and must not such a course of action defeat its purpose? We confess that we think so.

But to proceed. The real dramatic power of Mr. Kingsley is shown in the individuality given by him to characters introduced only for a single scene or speech,—counts, pages, monks, peasants, &c. An admirable sketch is that of "The Bishop of Bamberg," Elizabeth's uncle, the matter-of-fact, materialist, warlike Churchman of the middle ages. The harsh and selfish, yet shrewd, "Margravine Sophia," "the gentle Guta," the hard-hearted "Count Hugo," are all successful portraitures. The business of the drama is conducted without any reference whatsoever to time. An act occupies whole months. Many weeks elapse between two scenes. Mr. Kingsley may tell us that this reckless licence will be found in "Shakspeare" also; but this is not quite so; that is, Shakspeare always avoids shocking us by any such abrupt transition, by interposing some little scene, if only one betwixt two messengers, which gives the mind a little pause, and serves the purpose of a fall of the curtain between the acts. Despite this extreme dramatic *irregularity*, there is dramatic *life* throughout "The Saint's Tragedy:" every where, or almost every where, there is character in action, and conflict of passions, not so much between two individuals, (*this* very rarely), as betwixt the will and the reason of *some one*. Our readers may ask for some samples, and we feel that we ought to supply them, though a drama is no more to be judged of

than a *house* by mere specimen-bricks. It is the unfortunate *specimen-system*, carried on for a long time, which has so deadened the nation's sense of real dramatic power or genius.

Mr. Kingsley's lyrics have great merit, as may be gathered from the extracts we have already made: he has a real command of rhythm, and has produced certain novel effects, though sometimes his characteristic boldness leads to harshness even in this particular. We like much the song of the old knights passing on their way to the Crusades (see p. 137):—

"Our stormy sun is sinking,
Our sands are running low;
In one fair fight, before the night,
Our hard-worn hearts shall glow.

"We cannot pine in cloisters;
We cannot fast and pray;
The sword which built our load of guilt
Must wipe that guilt away.

"We know the doom before us;
The dangers of the road;
Have mercy, mercy, Jesu blest,
When we lie low in blood!

"When we lie gash'd and gory,
The holy walls within,
Sweet Jesu, think upon our end,
And wipe away our sin!"

The song of the "Boy-Crusaders," which follows, is bold, but characteristic:—

"The Christ-child sits on high—
He looks through the merry blue sky—
He holds in His hand, a bright lily-band,
For the boys who for Him die."

But we pause. These are not *dramatic* utterings, and it would be absurd to quote nothing but songs from a play. Let us bestow one word of praise on Elizabeth's charming song (p. 125), "Oh, that we two were maying!" and then turn to the *speeches* in the work before us. And, first, a few similes to suit the taste of the day. Lewis speaks.

"She loves me then!
She, who to me, *was as a nightingale*
That sings in magic gardens, rock-beleaguered,
To passing angels melancholy music."

Elizabeth says (p. 76):

> "Oh! contemplation palls upon the spirit,
> *Like the chill silence of an autumn sun.*"

A lady speaks, *converted* by Elizabeth (p. 91):

> "I will test these sorrows
> On mine own person: I have toy'd too long
> In painted pinnace down the stream of life,
> Witched with the landscape, while the weary rowers
> Faint at the groaning oar.

Elizabeth says herself, far more finely (p. 154):

> "'Twill end, girl, end: *no cloud across the sun*
> *But passes at the last, and gives us back*
> *The face of God once more.*"

Guta, her favourite maiden, says of the widowed Elizabeth, at the period of her extreme anguish, when Isentrudis, her nurse, asks, why she had stopped so long to pray,—

> "Oh, prayer to her rapt soul
> *Is like the drunkenness of the autumn bee,*
> *Who, scent enchanted, on the latest flower,*
> *Heedless of cold, will linger listless on,*
> *And freeze in odorous dreams.*"

But these prettinesses are not fair samples of the really great work, with all its faults, before us, which we could only duly illustrate by going through it "seriatim" from first to last, a task that would occupy thrice the number of pages we can possibly devote to this theme. We must quote two longer speeches of Elizabeth, as samples of the dramatic power of our author. The first is of a happy character. She has long loved Lewis secretly and unconsciously: but he, regarding her as a saint, had not dared to approach her as a wooer. Walter of Varila, however, has just sought her as his envoy, to make her the offer of his hand and heart. The ancient chronicle tells us that in the wild excitement of the moment, and the reaction from despair, she burst into childish laughter. After a few confused words, she thus proceeds:—

> "He told me once—one night,—
> When we did sit in the garden—What was I saying?
> *Walter.* My fairest princess, as ambassador,
> What shall I answer?
> *Elizabeth.* Tell him—tell him—God!
> Have I grown mad, or a child within the moment?—

The earth has lost her grey sad hue, and blazes
With her old life-light:—hark! *yon wind's a song,—*
Those clouds are angel's robes.—That fiery west
Is paved with smiling faces.—I am a woman,
And all things bid me love: my dignity
Is thus to cast my virgin pride away,
And find my strength in weakness.—Busy brain!
Thou keep'st pace with my heart:—old lore, old fancies,
Buried for years leap from their tombs, and proffer
Their magic service to my new-born spirit:—
I'll go,—I am not mistress of myself,—
Send for him—bring him to me—he is mine! [*Exit.*"

It were vain to comment on this passage to those who do not feel its force and truth: incidentally, however, it illustrates our former remark respecting the *passionate* nature of Elizabeth. The other passage we purpose to extract is of a far more serious, indeed, of an awful character. It occurs in the first scene of the fourth act, in the church of a convent, where Elizabeth is about to take the vows, from which, after all, she shrinks back. Conrad scoffs at her weakness, and leaves her alone to decide on her final course. The soliloquy which follows is as grand as it is terrible; its alternations of horrid doubt and dark sad faith, the mental struggle depicted, the dread internal conflict, make it altogether one of the most remarkable dramatic efforts we are acquainted with. It should be premised that Elizabeth is expected to vow that she will never see her children again, (hers and Lewis's, who has died in the Crusades), that she will "give them up," as far as this life is concerned. Thus then she speaks. (If our readers do not shudder at some of the ideas suggested, their nerves are firmer than our own. The italics, be it noted, are always ours.)

"*Eliz.* (*alone.*) Give up *his* children?—Why, I'd not give up
A lock of hair,—a glove, his hand had hallowed,—
And they are *his* gift, *his* pledge, *his* flesh and blood:
Tossed off for my ambition[1]! Ah, my husband!—
His ghost's sad eyes upbraid me.—Spare me! spare me!
I'd love thee still, if I dared: *but I fear God.*—
And shall I never more see loving eyes
Look into mine, until our dying day?—
That's this world's bondage: Christ would have me free,
And 'twere a pious deed to cut myself
The last, last strand, and fly:—but *whither? whither?*
What, if I cast away the bird i' the hand,
And found none in the bush? 'Tis possible—

[1] That is, saintship.

What right have I to arrogate Christ's bride-bed?
Crushed, widowed, sold to traitors? I, o'er whom
His billows and His storms are sweeping?—God's not angry:
No, not so much, as *we* with buzzing fly;
Or, in the moment of His wrath's awakening,
We should be nothing.—No, *there's worse than that:*
What if he but sat still, and let me be?
And these deep sorrows, which my vain conceit
Calls chastenings, meant for me, my ailment's cure,
Were lessons for some angels far away,
And I the corpus vile for the experiment?
The grinding of the sharp and pitiless wheels
Of some high Providence, which had its mainspring
Ages ago, and ages hence its end?
That were too horrible—
To have torn up all the roses from my garden
And planted thorns instead; to have forged my griefs,
And hugged the griefs I dared not forge; made earth
A hell, for hope of heaven; and after all
Those homeless moors of life toil'd through, to wake,
And find blank nothing!—*Is that angel world*
A gaudy window, which we paint ourselves,
To hide the dead void night beyond?—The present?
Why, here's the present:—like this arched gloom,
It hems our blind souls in, and roofs them o'er
With adamantine vault, *whose only voice*
Is our own wild prayer's echo: and our Future?
It rambles out in endless aisles of mist,
The further still the darker,—Oh, my Saviour!
My God! where art thou?—*That's* but a tale *about* Thee,
That crucifix above—it does but show Thee
As Thou wast once, but not as Thou art now—
Thy grief, but not Thy glory: where's *that* gone?—
I see it not without me; and within me
Hell reigns, not Thou!"

The grandeur and the horror of this have rarely, if ever, been surpassed. It is, no doubt, exquisitely painful, but this does not affect the high genius exhibited in the creation. We scruple not to own that we believe it literally truthful; that is, an embodiment of what an ascetic, *like* "*Elizabeth*," would be likely to feel at such an hour: yet it is most terrible. We seem to emerge from a cave of horror to God's sunshine, when we leave it behind us: we need to lift our hearts above and cry, "O God, Thou art *my* God, early will I seek Thee!" The beyond the grave, the behind the veil, is *no blank*, but an Infinite Reality. Creation is not an empty soap bubble: the soul of man is not a shade. *That*

God, who created all things, has not fashioned one human spirit but to an end. It is fitting that we should rehearse these verities, however briefly, after having transcribed this mighty hypothesis of despair. The moral of such a passage is designed for those who would deny themselves the lawful use of this world, and who may here learn that, seeking to sever themselves from earth, they may lose heaven as well. "Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving."

A few words more on the powerful but very painful work before us: it is not to be ignored: sooner or later it must find its settled niche in our national literature. It would be wrong in us not to observe, that it is founded in almost all particulars on "the Original Biography of Elizabeth," by Dietrich of Appold, her contemporary, as given entire by Canisius, and that the filling up is generally in keeping with these actual details. Mr. Kingsley has it in his power to achieve great things, but we cannot but see that it is not impossible his natural gifts should be abused to evil uses. The fresh mountain breeze, breathing the breath of life, stirring the waters to a joyous dance, this, far, far out on the wide ocean, may become the storm, which shall wreck many a gallant vessel. We have heard it rumoured that our author is an extreme democrat, has been even mixed up with the chartists; but we can scarcely believe this. His scorn of the fashionable political economy of the day, so admirably and pointedly expressed in the dialogue betwixt the abbot and the count (pp. 111—118 of this work), and the sound sense exhibited in various other passages, make us hope that his eyes are quite as open to the vices of an unshackled democracy, to the direst of all tyrannies, that of one sole absolute majority, as to the practical short-comings of our titled classes, and the sins of those who hold dignity amongst us, whether in Church or State. We are willing to trust that he is no more a destructive, than an obstructive, but an earnest Christian thinker, reverencing all the ordinances by God appointed, and desiring that the world should reverence them as well; which they are only likely to do when a great and glorious reformation has been effected, for which all good and true men must labour now together. Mr. Kingsley, we see, thinks much of the condition of the poor, and truly he has need to think; for, unless we can succeed in raising them in the social scale, and, above all, in leavening them with Christianity, a fearful future is before us.

We cannot forbear to quote a passage from a soliloquy of Walter of Varila's (p. 129), which aptly illustrates our author's powers of sarcasm, as well as his earnest indignation, in behalf of the poor against the "economists" of the present day:—

"Of all cruelties, save me from your small pedant, your closet-philosopher, *who has just courage enough to bestride his theory, without wit to see whither it will carry him.* In experience, a child; in obstinacy, a woman; in nothing a man but in logic-chopping; *instead of God's grace, a few copy-book headings about benevolence, and industry, and independence;* there is his metal. If the world will be mended on his principles, well; if not, poor world! but principles must be carried out, though through blood and famine; for truly man was made for theories, not theories for man. *A doctrine is these men's God; touch but that shrine, and lo! your simpering philanthropist becomes as ruthless as a Dominican.*"

"Bitter truths, these, my masters!" He who wrote this can never be a follower of the "Brights" and the "Cobdens." But no more on these political topics, all of which are naturally suggested by the very singular work before us.

We implore Mr. Kingsley, in conclusion, not to be bound by any *party-chains.* His acceptance of Professor Maurice's patronage seems quite out of keeping with his genius, and cannot be accounted for save on the score of some fancied party-tie. Let him take heed, that he be not numbered among the "Arnold-school," or, indeed, any other limited school or sect. Looking at the work we are reviewing, we cannot but avow that he is a man of genius; and, as such, we claim him for his Church, and for his country.

ART. VIII.—*Memoirs of the House of Brandenburg, and History of Prussia during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. By* LEOPOLD RANKE. *Translated from the German by* SIR ALEXANDER and LADY DUFF GORDON. *In Three Volumes.* London: Murray. 1849.

THE interest which we feel in the history of a nation or the life of an individual, is less in proportion to their intrinsic merits than to the result produced by their actions or exertions: a quiet and sensible man passes through the world unobserved, and though we may venerate his memory, we feel little inclination to write his life; while, on the other hand, he who raises himself from a cottage to a throne, or arrives at the highest distinctions of his own profession, will always be an object of curiosity. Kings while they live are always a sort of spectacle for the vulgar; their high station and supposed power create a sensation of awe in the breasts of those who gaze upon them. But, as history deals chiefly with kings, the monarchs of another century are often lost to our mind amidst the multitude who went before and who succeeded them; and, in a long dynasty, one or two only are found whose characters are remembered beyond their own country, and to whom distant nations accord the distinction of recollecting much more than their names.

As, however, in private life we read with intense interest the struggles of the rising barrister whom casual circumstances, as well as his own talents, afterwards placed upon the woolsack of England, so in history we look with admiration upon the prince who raises his State to a higher rank among kingdoms than it formerly possessed; his predecessors or his successors may be more worthy of our esteem, but the world is so constituted that results give prominence to character; and Alexander the Great, by extending his empire throughout Asia, has gained more celebrity than his father, whose exertions were confined to Greece. The earlier kings of Macedonia are scarcely known by name: Philip was the first who gave weight to his nation in the affairs of foreigners; we therefore feel an interest in him, on account of the effects produced by his reign.

Just so, in the history before us, Brandenburg is but a subordinate state of the German empire. A German electorate, with the pomp and ceremonial of royalty, the dependance of vassalage, and the cares and embarrassments of needy nobility,

often gives us a mere picture of poverty and pride. The grandfather of Frederick the Great was the first to raise the House of Brandenburg from this subordinate position, and to declare himself king of Prussia by the title of Frederick the First. This took place in July 1700; his coronation followed in January 1701. Much, however, still remained to be done; a royal crown gives only title without power; Austria held Silesia, to which Prussia had a prior claim; the army was small, the people uneducated, and little better than the serfs of the feudal system; and though neighbouring nations did not object to the royalty of King Frederick, they seemed little to respect or fear him in his new capacity. Till his death, in 1713, little progress seems to have been made; taxation and a new system of farming the crown lands were his principal objects. It was reserved for his son Frederick William I. and his grandson Frederick II., to give royal dignity to their newly-acquired crown, and to place Prussia in the rank of a powerful kingdom. Frederick William was a warrior, and had little else to recommend him; but a warrior was what Prussia required. Europe was in a state of great disorder, the wars of Louis XIV. had not yet subsided. To form an empire, then, it was necessary to raise a powerful army, and for this Frederick William had peculiar talents. He reigned till the year 1740; and then his celebrated son, with greater genius for war, and unrivalled versatility of talents, continued the aggrandizement of Prussia down to the time of the French revolution. To watch the gradual rise of empires and of men is, as we said before, the most interesting of all studies. Frederick William, therefore, and Frederick II. are characters on which history loves to dwell. Their minute actions and feelings are interesting to all; and as modern ingenuity now searches the archives of palaces, and brings to light letters and records long forgotten, we have ample materials for history and biography in the courts and times of these remarkable men. Nor is this interest without its moral use; successful exertion like theirs teaches mankind that they may rise to high stations by the diligent use of opportunities; and when we meet with the troubles, faults, and failings of kings and their children, we may learn contentment, in reading that the mightiest of the earth are, like ourselves, exposed to petty vexations, and not exempt from the weakness and trials to which ordinary mortals are liable.

Let us now, from the materials before us, consider a few of the characters presented on the scene.

Frederick William married the daughter of George I., and the unfortunate Sophia Dorothea; he was, therefore, brother-in-law of George II., whom he cordially disliked, and his son was cousin

to Frederick, prince of Wales, the father of George III. This relationship to England gives an additional interest to the Prussian family, as marriages between the royal families were frequently projected. As Frederick William's great object was his army, he became a thorough-going old soldier; the term 'good officer,' gives us too much the idea of a gentleman. Had we met him incognito, we should have supposed him to be a respectable coarse-minded adjutant, who had risen from the ranks. Continued drill, great anxiety about the appearance of his troops, minute knowledge of all the technicalities of mounting guard, manœuvring, and reviewing, great nicety as to the dress of officers and men; these were the great subjects that occupied the king's mind, and every thing else seemed worse than useless, as it only tended to distract attention from the study of his favourite science. He must have been the most disagreeable companion in private life that we can well imagine: his children actually trembled at his presence, and his wife seemed in continual danger of losing her life by his violence. We have the best account of the "old Corporal" from his eldest daughter, Wilhelmina, afterwards margravine of Bareith. Her private memoirs, published towards the end of the last century, were at one time supposed to be a forgery; we believe, however, that their authenticity has since been established. They certainly carry with them the internal evidence of truth; we can perceive all through the graphic descriptions of an eye-witness; and if not actually written by the princess herself, the author must have been well acquainted with her, and with the habits and feelings of the court. We give a few anecdotes of the king's domestic life, extracted at random from his daughter's memoirs. It appears, that the Prince Frederick and his sister had gone to their mother's room on some occasion, when their father was supposed to be absent: he returned suddenly, and both of them, fearing his displeasure, hid themselves, Wilhelmina in a closet, and Frederick under the bed. The old king continued for some hours in conversation with his wife, and the prince and princess remained in their undignified position till they were nearly smothered.

Sometimes, it appears, that Frederick William was seized with a fit of religious melancholy: he would then send for a clergyman named Franke, who lectured the family all the time of dinner, and made them feel as dull as the monks of La Trappe; he condemned all amusements, and would not allow any conversation in his presence, except upon the subject of religion. The king, at these times, used to preach a sermon to his family every afternoon; his valet acted as his clerk, and his children were obliged

to affect a contrite and penitent air, which only taught them hypocrisy. On these occasions, the king would talk of resigning his throne, and setting up for a country farmer: Wilhelmina was to be his washerwoman; Frederica, a younger daughter, being, as he said, the most avaricious of the family, was to be the storekeeper; Charlotte, a third daughter, was to attend the market and be his cook. If the king had really had any feeling of true religion, we might sympathize with his care of his family, and even if he were somewhat prolix in his sermons, we might commend his zeal rather than his discretion; but he seems to have had little idea on the subject of his duty towards God; and the course which he pursued shows that his sermons and advice proceeded rather from a determination to exact military obedience from his children, than from any sincere desire for their spiritual good. His daughter says of him,—

"We shortly after followed the king to Potsdam, where he had a violent fit of the gout in both feet. This illness, added to the vexation of seeing his hopes vanished, put him into an insupportable humour. The pains of purgatory could not equal those we endured. We were obliged to be in the king's room by nine o'clock in the morning, we dined there, and durst not leave it on any account. The king passed the whole day in abusing my brother and me. He called me the English baggage, and my brother the rascally Frederick. He forced us to eat and drink things which we disliked or which disagreed with our constitutions; this ill-judged severity sometimes made us throw up in his presence all we had in our stomachs. Every day was marked by some unlucky event: we could not lift up our eyes without beholding some ill-fated being tormented in one way or other. The impatience of the king would not suffer him to lie in bed. He was placed in an arm-chair, upon casters, and rolled about all over the palace. His arms rested on crutches. We followed this triumphal car every where, like unfortunate captives undergoing their punishment. The poor king was really suffering violent pains, and the overflowing of black bile caused his intolerable humour."—*Memoirs of the Margravine of Bareith*, vol. i. p. 148. Edition of 1812.

The great grievance of the family appears to have been the concern which her parents took as to Wilhelmina's settlement in life. She does not venture to give us a description of herself in her own words, but she quotes the expressions of some of her friends, which are any thing but flattering to her beauty. She was low in stature, sharp-featured, exceedingly plain, and, we suspect, slightly marked with the small-pox: be this as it may, to provide her with a husband seemed to be the great object at which her parents zealously aimed, and which she herself as carefully avoided. Her cousin Frederick, prince of Wales, as

heir-apparent to the crown of England, presented a grand object for her father's ambition; but the match was broken off by some offence given by George II. or his ambassador. Though she had never seen her cousin, she confesses considerable aversion to him; and probably would have begun her matrimonial career, like Mrs. Malaprop, by hating him like a blackamoor. After the prince of Wales, the next on the list was Count Weissenfield, a distant relation and pensioner of the king of Poland: he seems to have been in no way an eligible match, as he is described as poor and dissipated; but for some reason Frederick William had set his heart on having him for a son-in-law. Quarrels, faintings, beatings, and threats of imprisonment, produced little effect upon the princess; at last the old king, who seems to have been more anxious for the removal of his daughter than for her domestic comfort, introduced a third suitor, the Margrave of Schwedt. Wilhelmina would now have been too glad to have fallen back upon her cousin the prince of Wales, as the least evil of the three; but her uncle, George II., had other views for his son, and allowed his German cousins to settle their disputes without his interference. Then followed a most extraordinary series of domestic quarrels. Sometimes the king would lay hold of his daughter, and she would endeavour to escape. On one occasion her governess, Madame de Sonsfield, came to the rescue, and at the same moment the princess tripped over a screen; she fell, she says, between the hammer and the anvil, receiving all the blows intended either for herself or her governess; till, being near the hearth, she was only saved from her father's rage when her clothes began to catch fire. Wilhelmina, however, still held out against matrimony, till the 10th of May, 1731, which she says was the most memorable day of her life. On this occasion an emissary from the king visited her in the morning before she had left her bed; he told her he had just seen her mother and the king; the former in tears, the latter in a violent passion; that he had received orders to make immediate preparations for the wedding; and that the queen's entreaties were of no avail. "The king," said he, "finding himself thwarted, turned round to Madame de Sonsfield, and swore, with the most bitter imprecations, that he would drive her from the court, and, as an example of his severity, he will have her publicly whipped as the cause of your disobedience. 'I pity you,' said the king to the governess, 'to be condemned to such an infamous chastisement; but it rests with the princess to rescue you from this disgrace. It must be confessed, however, that it will be a fine sight, and that the blood which will run down your white back will heighten its whiteness, and be delightful to look upon.'" (See *Memoirs*, vol. i. p. 299.)

The princess herself was to be confined in a fortress, and she was informed that the horses were ready to convey her thither. Women, however, generally manage to have their own way. Madame de Sonsfield was the first to advise Wilhelmina to persist in her purpose, and refuse the Polish count; and the queen wrote to her that the solitude of a prison was preferable to an ill-assorted marriage. We fear she could speak from experience. The matter was at length compromised by Wilhelmina's accepting the eldest son of the margrave of Bareith, a distant relation of her own, and to whom she entertained less objection than to the others. She does not pretend to any romantic attachment to her new suitor; indeed it seems, according to custom, she fainted when he was first mentioned; but by her own account she made a good wife, except that she was sometimes jealous; and her husband seems to have shown her as much kindness as could well be expected from a German prince of the eighteenth century.

To his son, Prince Frederick, the king was even more severe: "ce coquin Fritz" was his common designation. The prince was much attached to his sister, and they always took the part of each other; he was, therefore, involved in her misdemeanours. But there was another insuperable reason for the old soldier's dislike of his son. Frederick studied other subjects than war; and though his subsequent life proved his vast military genius, yet he could read classics, play on the flute, and take delight in the fine arts. All these accomplishments the king regarded as crimes: he believed that no man who wrote verses could drill a regiment. Frederick wrote poetry, and his father drew a logical conclusion that he never could make a soldier.

Musicians also were his detestation; and once, when Frederick was sitting in his dressing-gown with a young man who gave lessons on the flute, he was obliged to hide his teacher on the approach of his father, who only vented his rage upon the dressing-gown, which he tore to pieces, and threw into the fire. The dislike, however, of the king to his son went to much greater lengths. Few young men ever endured such privations and annoyances as the prince of Prussia. His father, in one of his fits of passion, attempted to strangle him with the cord of a window-curtain, in which he became entangled. He pulled the string which was round his son's neck, and nearly lifted him off the ground. The prince declared to his sister that his life was only saved by the interference of the servants. Though Frederick held the commission of a general officer, his father struck him repeatedly with his cane; and when his son received the insult in silence, he taunted him as a coward, telling him, that had his father treated him so, he would have fled from the country. The

patience of the prince was at length worn out, and he determined to take refuge in England. His flight was arranged for a time during one of the king's long marches, when the party had halted for the night at a farm-house; and the king and his suite occupied a barn, and the prince and his attendants slept in another at some little distance. Frederick's scheme, however, was betrayed, and he was arrested in the act of mounting his horse. His father had him and his friend, Lieutenant Katt, tried as deserters by a court-martial, and sentence of death was recorded against them both. The prince was closely imprisoned, without his books or his flute, or even a bed; he was allowed only sixpence a day for his food; and it seems as if his father intended either to put him to death, or to compel him to renounce his right of succession. The queen and the princesses actually believed at one time that Frederick had been executed. Whether his father really intended to have gone so far cannot now be proved; certain it is that the officers about the king declared that as an electoral prince Frederick was subject to the laws of the empire, and therefore could not be tried by his father's court; and old General Mosel, seeing the king greatly enraged, put a sword into his hand, and exclaimed, "Sire, slay me, but spare your son." But if the king did not intend to take away his son's life, he certainly determined to wound his feelings in every possible way. There was a young girl of low birth, named Doris Ritter, whose company Frederick had sought, as she was a good musician. The king accused her of being his son's mistress. Though he did not bring any proof of his assertion, he seized her, and without a trial sentenced her to be conducted through the streets by the common hangman, and then publicly whipped in presence of his son, whom he forced to attend. While Frederick was in prison, an officer of the court was sent to him on some message. He happened to be dressed in a scarlet cloak. As soon as Frederick saw this, he believed that his father had sent the executioner to put him to the torture. But what most deeply hurt the feelings of the unfortunate young prince was the tragic end of his friend and companion, Lieutenant Katt. Though the grandson of one of the most distinguished Prussian generals; though the greatest interest was exerted in his favour; and though Frederick professed his willingness to renounce his claim to the throne, in order to save his friend, the king was inexorable, and the sentence of the court-martial was carried out. A scaffold was erected under the window of the prince's prison. Katt was led forth between two clergymen, and with his last words addressed the prince, assuring him of his devoted attachment, and his willingness to suffer death for his

sake. The prince saw his friend's head roll on the scaffold, and fainted in the arms of his attendants.

These events happened in the year 1730, and the king did not receive his son till the next year. In the year 1740, Frederick William died. In the same year died also Charles VI., emperor of Austria, so the power of Germany passed into new hands. The emperor was succeeded in his hereditary dominions, Hungary and Silesia, by his daughter Maria Theresa, "The queen whose beauty set the world in arms." This had been arranged some years before by the act of settlement, commonly called the Pragmatic Sanction. The empire, being elective, passed after some delay into the hands of Charles Albert of Bavaria, who reigned by the title of Charles VII. till his death in January, 1745. The new choice fell upon the Grand Duke of Tuscany, the husband of Maria Theresa, known in history as Francis I.

We now come to consider the character of the queen of Prussia, Sophia Dorothea, the mother of Frederick the Great. From the daughter of George I., much delicacy or refinement could not be expected; and we find her at first in grievous terror of her husband, and endeavouring by all her arts to soften his unkindness towards his children; she does not, however, appear to have been much more worthy of their love. The Princess Wilhelmina confesses that the unkindness of her mother was her principal motive for accepting the addresses of the prince of Bareith. Like the king, she seemed to prefer the Polish count; and when the young margrave appeared, she did all in her power to break off the match, although she had at first given her consent. Wilhelmina now found that the other ladies of the court followed the queen's example, and treated her with contempt: her patience was severely tried by their insolence; they had sought her patronage while she was her mother's favourite, but they now despised her as a discarded courtier. She was, therefore, the more inclined to leave the court of Berlin, and seek an establishment with her husband. She tells us she only publishes an extract from one of her mother's letters, lest it should reflect upon her memory: we give the extract, but we confess we are at a loss to divine what the rest of the letter must have been:—

"You break my heart, by giving me the most violent pain I ever felt in my life. I had placed all my hopes in you; but I did not know you; you have artfully disguised the malice of your soul, and the meanness of your sentiments. I repent a thousand times over the kindness I have had for you, the cares I have taken of your education, and the torments I have endured for your sake. I no longer acknowledge you for my daughter, and shall henceforth consider you as my most cruel

enemy, since it is you that sacrifice me to my persecutors, who triumph over me. Rely on me no longer. I vow you eternal hatred, and shall never forgive you."—*Memoirs*, vol. i. 311.

The Princess Wilhelmina draws such strongly coloured pictures, that we begin to suspect some defect in her own powers of vision; but she seems to have been a person of great natural abilities. Her mother once, when she was a child, laid a wager that she could learn 150 verses in an hour. The lady who doubted her powers replied, "I will try her local memory;" she then wrote down 150 names of her own invention, to each of which a number was annexed, and read them twice over. The princess was then called upon to repeat them, which she did with little hesitation; the numbers were then called out of their order, and the princess again succeeded in giving the names. Her great talent seems to have been for description or sketching characters. We have, in a few lines, the appearance of the character and manners of some of the most remarkable personages of the day. Among others George I., Peter the Great, and the Empress Catherine. Of the first she says:—

"The king of England was a prince who valued himself on his sentiments; but, unfortunately, he had never applied to the enlightening of his mind. Many virtues, carried to an extreme, become vices; this was his case. He affected a firmness which degenerated into harshness, and a tranquillity which might be called indolence. His generosity extended only to his favourites and mistresses, by whom he suffered himself to be governed; the rest of mankind were excluded. Since his accession to the crown, his haughtiness had become insupportable. Two qualities, however, his equity and justice" (we should have thought these the same), "rendered him estimable. He was by no means an evil-disposed prince, but rather constant in his benevolence. His manners were cold; he spoke little, and listened only to puerilities."—*Memoirs*, vol. i. 70.

Of Catherine, the queen of Peter the Great, and her husband, we read:—

"The czarina was short and stout, very tawny, and her figure was altogether destitute of gracefulness. Its appearance sufficiently betrayed her low origin. To have judged by her attire, one would have taken her for a German stage actress. Her robe had been purchased at an old-clothes broker's; it was made in the antique fashion, and heavily laden with silver and grease. The front of her stays was adorned with jewels singularly placed—they represented a double eagle, badly set, the wings of which were of small stones; she wore a dozen orders, and as many portraits of saints, and relics fastened to the facing of her gown; so that when she walked, the jumbling of all these

orders and portraits, one against the other, made a tinkling noise like a mule in harness.

"The czar, on the contrary, was very tall and pretty well made: his face was handsome, but his countenance had something savage about it, which inspired fear. He was dressed as a navy officer, and wore a plain coat. The czarina, who spoke very bad German, and did not well understand what was spoken to her by the queen, beckoned to her fool, and conversed with her in Russian. This poor creature was a Princess Galitzen, who had been necessitated to fulfil that office in order to save her life; having been twice implicated in a conspiracy against the czar."—*Memoirs*, vol. i. 44.

The margravine is a thorough-going gossip, and the petty courts of Germany give a wonderful field for the exercise of her peculiar talent. As Englishmen, we all value royalty: the dignity of the king, the splendour of his court, the ceremony with which royal personages must be treated, have all their value. They give dignity to the executive government, and teach the world that laws must be enforced and power reverenced. If, however, every county in England were a separate principality; if every duke and marquis were to be treated as a sovereign prince, the good sense of England would soon consider such idle ceremony as a useless burden. The margravine gives us a continued history of petty sovereigns,—a long detail of pride, poverty, and etiquette,—amusing enough to the reader, but tiresome in the extreme to those engaged in the farce. Tables of precedence were multiplied till they had become inexplicable. The heir of the margrave brought home his bride, and she was, of course, to be received with all the honours of expectant sovereignty. But she finds her new palace cold and comfortless; numerous servants in tarnished liveries; great rooms surrounded with worm-eaten tapestry, and letting in the cold through broken doors and cracked wainscots. The dinners were served with the greatest pomp: trumpets sounded, cymbals played, and a guard attended. The meal sometimes lasted for three hours; but the food was so badly cooked that the princess could not eat it, and managed, with the help of her governess, to have her food dressed in her own room. These princes were in continual want of money. Wilhelmina and her husband proposed to visit the king of Prussia at Berlin: they entered into a long calculation as to the probable expense of the journey, and then tried to prevail on the old margrave to find the funds: he sent them about a third of what they required; and as they thought it too little, the journey was put off. About the same time, the governess of Wilhelmina complained that one of the ladies at Bareith took precedence of her in going into a carriage. The dispute went on to some height, but at

last it was settled on the principle, that Wilhelmina being of royal descent, her attendant had a right to a higher position than the wife of an officer of a prince who could not claim royal honours. Now, though it is not fair to despise a race of nobility merely on account of their poverty, yet we confess we think the pride of these German barons must have been a source of unmixed vexation to themselves and their dependants: to be obliged continually to claim respect which there is no power to enforce, to be constantly indebted for pecuniary assistance to those whom the debtor feels it a duty to despise,—all give us an idea of an unsound state of society; and while we look up with respect to the nobility of England, we congratulate them and ourselves that they are content with the titles and wealth of the peerage, without arrogating the state of royalty, or insisting upon the honours of sovereign princes.

But other misfortunes awaited the Princess Wilhelmina at Bareith. Her governess and chief friend, Madame de Sonsfield, proposed to bring with her to Bareith her sister, named Flora, and two nieces, named La Marwitz. The king of Prussia disapproved of their plan, as he had made a law that no Prussian heiress should marry out of his dominions; however, after many promises, the king consented. Flora, after some time, began to wish for a respectable settlement for herself; and the margrave, father-in-law to Wilhelmina, began to think of her as a second wife. Of this project La Marwitz informed Wilhelmina, who saw herself threatened with a step-mother in the person of her humble dependant. The margrave, though not fifty years of age, seems to have grown fat and stupid, and to have cared for little but wine and reading Telemachus. Flora, who had but little sense, thought only of her own advancement, and of the precedence which her marriage would give her above her patroness. Madame de Sonsfield feared the king of Prussia, and expected that the whole family would be imprisoned for life for disobedience to the laws; so the whole party were thrown into the most amusing confusion. The women, however, managed to persuade Flora to discard her princely suitor, and she wrote to him declining his offer of marriage, but in such terms, Wilhelmina tells us, that she might still be of use to her patroness, by holding her ascendancy over the old gentleman's affections. Flora de Sonsfield does not seem to have had much to recommend her, as she is described in the following terms:—

"She is only five feet high. She is exceedingly corpulent, and lame in the left foot; when young she was a perfect beauty, but her features had become so coarse from the small-pox, that she could no longer be considered as such: her countenance, however, is prepossessing, and

her eyes delusively sparkling and expressive; her head, which is too big for her little body, gives her a dwarfish appearance; her figure, however, is not remarkable: her manners are graceful, and such as prove her acquaintance with high life. Her heart is excellent; she is gentle and accommodating; and, in one word, her character is unblemished; but Heaven has not blessed her with intellect: she possesses a certain fashionable routine that veils this deficiency, which can only be found out in private intercourse. She had been struck with the advantageous offers of the margrave, and overcome by her vanity and ambition; and the narrowness of her understanding had prevented her from foreseeing the consequences."—*Memoirs*, ii. 177.

Having thus described the near relations of the hero of Prussia, we now come to the leading character of the history, Frederick the Great. He was certainly a great man in one sense of the word: he possessed a greater variety of talents than usually falls to the lot of a single individual; he fully inherited his father's taste for war; and during a long reign of nearly forty-six years, and during violent commotions, battles, and sieges, he proved himself a consummate master of the art. His literary talents are also very uncommon for a king and a soldier: like Cæsar, he has left us the history of his own campaigns; but Cæsar only professed to be a warrior and historian, Frederick attempted nearly every species of literature. Fifteen volumes of his posthumous works, in French, contain poems, letters, history, essays on politics, morals, and infidelity. He made himself acquainted with the most distinguished literary men of his time; and we have whole volumes of his correspondence with D'Alembert, Jordan, and Voltaire. He wrote an elaborate treatise in answer to Macchiavelli's Art of Governing by Deceit. In this he lays down as a first principle, that a king holds office for the benefit of his subjects. This is certainly a strong sentiment for an absolute monarch, and it is one on which Frederick did not always act. He certainly was capable of strong acts of tyrannical justice, and would sometimes hear a cause which had been decided, and if he did not approve of what had been done, he would reverse the decision and degrade the judge. He played the king through life; he acted strenuously and on his own judgment, with little advice from his ministers, whose duty he believed it to be to obey orders, and not to question them. By this means he certainly founded a great empire; he made the power of Prussia respected by foreigners; and where the laws were defective, he made new ones to suit the exigency of the times. His people advanced under his care; and if he were arbitrary, it was generally because he supposed he was acting for the public good. But with all these qualities, which mankind admire, and which stamp the greatness

of the king, Frederick, like his father, was, we fear, a very bad man in private life. He treated his wife ill. Constrained to marry, when, like his sister, he had no thoughts of marriage, he had no fancy for the princess of Brunswick Bevern, whom his father had selected for him; he says himself, in a letter to his sister,—

"Until this time my fate has been mild. I have lived pleasantly in my garrison: my flute, my books, and the company of some kind friends, have made my life tolerable; and they would compel me to abandon this tranquillity, and to marry the Princess de Bevern, whom I do not know. They have extorted a consent from me which has occasioned me much uneasiness. Must one suffer for ever these tyrannies without the hope of a change?"

The queen, his mother, adds at the same time:—

"The princess is handsome, but as vulgar as a basket-woman; she has not the least education. I don't know how my son will reconcile himself to this young ape."—*Memoirs*, ii. 28.

The consequence was, Frederick neglected his wife; he passed his time at Sans Souci [1], and the queen lived at a palace at some distance. He visited her occasionally, and dined at her table, but generally left the room without addressing a word to her. He seems to have been entirely absorbed in business. All letters or applications must be written on one side of a sheet of paper and addressed to himself; he always read these himself, and wrote a few words on each, from which his secretaries gathered the answer they were to make. He kept four private secretaries: they were obliged to remain unmarried, and in a kind of honourable imprisonment, as they were never allowed to mix in society, lest they should divulge any of the royal secrets; they were obliged to be in continual attendance, and probably an attempt at resignation would have led to the forfeiture of life or perpetual imprisonment. In religion Frederick was a blasphemous infidel; his essays on religion contain the most determined and shocking infidelity that can well be imagined. In early life he had made some profession of religion. Katt declared that he had seen several essays on religious subjects by him, in which he maintained the doctrines of Calvin [2]. His father, who hated Calvinism, sent several theo-

[1] This palace derives its name from a tomb which Frederick had erected for himself near the entrance of one of the gardens. It was surmounted by a statue of Flora, and bore the inscription,—

Ici je serai
Sans Souci.

The large letters caught the eyes of passengers, and gave a name to this celebrated palace, which conveys a meaning exactly opposite to that which the king intended.

[2] See Ranke, vol. i. p. 317.

logians to argue with his son, who was then in prison; and after several disputations the prince declared that whichever were the true view of Scripture, neither one nor the other was worth a martyrdom. We suspect that he always disliked religion itself, as well as his father's sermons, and only wanted the tuition of his friend Voltaire to render him an unbeliever, if not an atheist. The tree is known by its fruits; and if philosophy could render him a just judge, or a love of public applause could lead him to generous actions, we cannot expect that it could either change his heart or give him a motive for serving God, whose Word he slighted and whose religion he abhorred.

He is said to have had hereditary claims to Silesia: they had certainly lain dormant for a very long period. His first act was to seize upon this province, and he thus involved Europe in wars which lasted during the greater part of his life. How far such an act is justifiable, even on philosophic principles, is not for us to determine. We should think, on Christian principles, there can be no question upon the subject. As soon, however, as Silesia was in his possession, he justified his holding it on Protestant principles. He cannot, he says, cede the province to Maria Theresa, because it would be betraying his Protestant subjects into the hands of the Pope. Now, as God overrules evil for good, Frederick was certainly an instrument in his hands for promoting religious liberty. No prince ever more firmly held or more strenuously supported the principles of universal toleration. In his letters to Voltaire we have a long correspondence on the subject of a young man named Etallonde, who had been persecuted in Switzerland, and whom Voltaire sent into Prussia. Frederick calls him "DivusEtallon dus," and writes of him as a martyr. We believe, however, that this conduct did not proceed from any love of truth or religion; he saw the frightful evils of Papal tyranny, and the inquisition, and these he was determined to oppose at all hazards. His religious liberality and his determination to overthrow every persecuting power reminds us of King Nebuchadnezzar, who passed the first act of toleration on record: "Therefore I make a decree, that every people, nation, and language, which speak any thing amiss against the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, shall be cut in pieces, and their houses made a dunghill."

The sayings and sentiments of a great man are matter of interest to general readers; we shall, therefore, give a few of these extracted from his writings. On the subject of Capital Punishment, which is now so much discussed, he says:—

"It is very wrong that judges should be in haste in pronouncing sentence; and it is better to allow a guilty man to escape than to destroy

one who is innocent. However, I am quite convinced by experience, that it is not proper to neglect any of the restraints by which men are governed; I mean, rewards or punishments: and there are cases where atrocity of crime calls down the severity of the law. Murderers and incendiaries, for example, deserve the punishment of death, because they have assumed a tyrannical power over the lives and property of others. I believe that perpetual imprisonment is in effect a more cruel punishment than death; but it is not so striking as that which is done before the eyes of the multitude, because spectacles of this kind make more impression than any description of the miseries which those endure who languish in a dungeon."—*Oeuvres Post. de Fred.*, vol. xii. p. 344. Ed. Berlin, 1789.

He had evidently a great dislike to the English language:—

"As England was conquered by the Romans, the Saxons, the Danes, and the Normans, the language," he says, "is a jargon formed of a mixture of these; and it is, at least, as coarse as any of its component parts. At the revival of literature England, being always jealous of France, aspired to the production of authors, and the improvement of her language; and, in order to do this, she appropriated such terms from Latin, French, and Italian, as she judged necessary. She had her celebrated writers, but they could not soften her sharp sounds, which grate upon the ears of foreigners: other idioms lose by translation, but English idioms alone are gainers. I once heard the question proposed by some literary men, 'What language did the serpent speak in Paradise?' 'It must have been English,' was the reply, 'for the serpent hissed.' You may take this bad joke for what it is worth."—vol. xiii. p. 393.

Frederick honoured the memory of the Chevalier Bayard of Grenoble, one of the knights of Francis the First of France. His motto was, "Sans peur et sans reproche." Frederick instituted the order of knighthood called from his name, with the motto of his hero, and a sword surmounted by a crown of laurels. The knights were twelve in number, generally his own near relations or neighbouring princes: each knight assumed a particular title of virtue on his admission to the order. One was named the Chaste, another the Temperate, another the Stout-hearted; Frederick assumed the surname of the Constant. Besides the ordinary duties of chivalry, the object of the order was to improve military science, to study the tactics and campaigns of ancient heroes, to lay up a store of brilliant points and military problems. It is, perhaps, to this institution we owe some of the treatises on military science, which Frederick has left behind him. (See *Post. Works*, vol. xiii. p. 367.)

It is extraordinary that Frederick, though despotic at home, should have been opposed to royal power in the government of

other nations. He thus writes of Lord Bute and the English political system of that day :—

"It is the Scotchman Bute who governs the king and the kingdom. Like those evil spirits of whom we hear so much, but whom we never see, he envelopes his operations in the deepest darkness; his emissaries and creatures are the springs by which he moves the political machine according to his own will. His system is that of the ancient Tories, who assert that the happiness of England requires that the king should enjoy despotic power; and that, far from forming alliances with the continental powers, Great Britain ought to confine herself to the object of extending her commercial interests. He looks on Paris as Cato the censor did on Carthage; and if he had all the French vessels together, he would crush them at one blow. Imperious and harsh in his government, unscrupulous in the use of his means, his mismanagement throws him back upon his obstinacy. To carry out his grand schemes, this minister has introduced corruption into the lower house. A million sterling which the nation pays annually to the king for the support of the civil list, is scarcely sufficient to satisfy the venality of members of parliament. This sum, which is intended to support the royal family, the court, and the ambassadors, is employed every year in depriving the nation of its energy. And George the Third has no means of supporting his royal dignity in London, except 500,000 crowns which he draws from his electorate of Hanover."

This we do not believe; but, with more truth and great sagacity, Frederick proceeds to show, that

"Want of money had led Lord Bute to attempt the taxation of the American colonies; and that the result would be the destruction of British power over the States."—vol. iv. p. 148.

The admirers of Frederick the Second compare him with Philip of Macedon; and there are, certainly, many points of similarity both in their characters and circumstances. Both were the means of raising a small kingdom to the rank of a powerful nation; both were skilful masters of the art of war; and both gave great attention to financial affairs; both could combine the characters of the lion and the fox; and both, while studiously endeavouring to amass wealth, were ready to spend it to the last, in order to carry out their objects. Philip was a generous enemy, and after the battle of Cheronæa, refused to destroy Athens, because, he said, that as he had fought for glory, and had obtained it from the Athenians, it would be ungrateful to destroy a city which had given him his object. Frederick could treat a treacherous enemy with equal magnanimity, as he proved in the case of Augustus the Third, king of Poland.

The two monarchs are remarkable for their appreciation of literature. Philip's letter to the Athenians is a masterpiece of powerful and concise argument; and he congratulates himself

less on the birth of an heir to his dominions, than on the fact that Aristotle should be the tutor to his son. It is remarkable that both these great men should have come in contact with the most powerful intellects of their day; and though the terms on which they met were exactly opposite, yet, in each case, the celebrity of the king is increased by his proximity to contemporary genius. Philip's great enemy was Demosthenes; Frederick's chief friend was Voltaire. Philip would willingly have pursued his plans in secret, his object was personal and national aggrandizement; and could Macedon have risen in the scale of nations, and Philip have gained over the Grecian colonies on his coast one by one, he would have allowed matters to remain very quiet, and would have felt satisfied in his own persevering improvement of his country. But the overwhelming genius of a single orator, while it marred many of his favourite schemes for the moment, has immortalized his actions, and involuntarily shed a lustre upon his whole history. Frederick had his flatterers, as all great men have; but we doubt if any of them has given him so high a character for heroism as Demosthenes has given to Philip. He describes him as struggling against bad fortune, repairing his disasters in one place by his successes in another; wintering in the open air amidst the snows of Thrace; exposing his person in every encounter, bruised in his thigh, his eye transpierced with an arrow, yet eager to sacrifice whatever remained of his body, and of his life, provided he may accomplish his purpose and secure his renown. Philip at one time patronized Theopompus, the Chian, as his friend and historian; but on some trifling cause of quarrel, the historian endeavoured to blacken the reputation of his patron, by accusing him of the most disgraceful crimes. Frederick, before his quarrel with Voltaire, has left us several volumes of his correspondence with him. Mutual flattery is the staple commodity of these. We give a few specimens. In a letter, dated the 4th of September, 1749, the king thus concludes an invitation to Prussia:—

"Finally, you are like the white elephant, for which the king of Persia and the Great Mogul go to war, and with whose name they increase their titles when they are happy enough to possess him. If you come here, you shall see at the head of mine, Frederick, by the grace of God, king of Prussia, elector of Brandenburg, possessor of Voltaire," &c. &c.

That Voltaire could repay his patron in kind we see from many of his letters. Thus, on the 1st of May, 1775, he writes:—

"Your letter is a masterpiece of reason, wit, good taste, and kindness;"

then in verse he adds:—

"It is the sage who instructs us, The hero who civilizes us. Nothing so fine has been produced upon Parnassus or in the Church, &c. &c." —*Post. Works*, viii. 317.

In the same year he writes:—

"You overwhelm me with kindness. Your majesty changes the last miseries of my life into brighter days."

Then, after a few lines, he adds in verse:—

"Who is this astonishing Proteus? One would say that he held the lyre of Apollo. When I run to hear, and flatter myself with delight, I find that it is the bloody armour of Mars that he bears. Let us then examine the hero.—But, no: he is Plato, he is Lucian, he is Cicero; and if he pleased, he could be Epicurus, &c. &c."—*Post. Works*, viii. 296.

The friendship, however, of these literary allies ended in a grievous contention, and each had recourse to his natural weapons,—Frederick to his power, Voltaire to his wit. Frederick ordered Voltaire's Akakia to be burnt by the hangman in presence of its author, and Voltaire revenged himself by a series of lampoons.

In all that we have read or quoted on the subject of King Frederick and his family, we cannot help remarking the great want of any thing like religion. From the great patron of Protestantism something might have been expected; and though Ranke intimates that the king was opposed to priestcraft, and not to religion, we cannot help coming to the conclusion, that he was neither more nor less than a disciple of Voltaire. His own writings contain the best key to his sentiments; and these are melancholy proofs, that when man sets up his own reason as his idol, he goes more and more astray from the knowledge of God and his ways. In his father, Frederick William, we might have expected to find some serious thought; though sadly mistaken as to the government of his family, yet he certainly endeavoured to bring religious truth before their minds: his long sermons, his tedious chaplains, his acknowledgment of the vanity of the world, might have led us to suppose, that he had some right feeling as to his state before God; and that at the hour of his extremity, his hopes for eternity might have been found placed on the true foundation of the sinner's confidence. But, alas! this is not the case; his daughter Wilhelmina, who is so fond of minute details, gives us a lamentable account of his death-bed scene, which she describes as melancholy and heroic.

"He had been very ill the whole night through. At seven in the morning, he caused himself to be drawn in his rolling chair to the apartment of the queen, who was still asleep, not believing him so dangerously ill. 'Rise,' said he to her; 'I have but a few hours to live: I wish to have, at least, the satisfaction of dying in your arms.' . . . . He said to the prince of Anholt, 'You are the oldest of my generals, and you deserve to have my best horse.' He ordered it immediately to be brought. And seeing the prince-royal affected, 'It is the lot of man,' said he; 'we must all pay the tribute to nature.' But, apprehensive lest his firmness might be shaken by the tears and lamentations of those who were present, he signified to them to withdraw, and gave orders to all his servants to wear a new livery which he had caused to be made for them, and that his regiment should wear a new uniform." (The ruling passion here was strong in death.) "The queen then entered; she had scarcely been a quarter of an hour in the room, when the king fainted away: he was immediately put to bed, when, by means of the efforts employed, he was restored to his senses. Looking around him, and seeing the servants in their new dresses, he said, 'Vanity of vanities, all is vanity.' Then addressing his first physician, he asked him if his end was near: the physician having informed him that he had still half an hour to live, he asked for a looking-glass; and having looked at himself in it, he smiled and said, 'I am very much changed; I shall cut a very ugly appearance when dying.' He reiterated his question to the physicians; and on their telling him that a quarter of an hour had elapsed, and that his pulse was ascending, 'So much the better,' he answered; 'I shall soon return to nothing.' They then wished that two clergymen might enter to pray with him, but he told them that he knew all they had to say, and that they might therefore withdraw. He became weaker and weaker, and at last expired at midday." —*Memoirs*, vol. ii. 341.

When Wilhelmina describes the death-bed of her father-in-law, the margrave of Bareith, she gives us an equally unhappy picture of the low state of religion among the German Protestants of that day:—

"One day, when we were at table, a message was brought us from the margrave's, that he was in the last agony. We found him stretched on a sofa: he had been seized with a suffocation which brought him to the verge of the grave, and his pulse was like that of a person at the point of death. He looked at us without saying a word. An ecclesiastic was sent for, but he appeared displeased at this. The priest delivered a very fine exhortation to him on the state in which he was; told him he was on the point of appearing before God to render an account of his actions; and advised him to humble himself to his holy will, and he would receive courage to look on death with fortitude. 'I have administered justice,' said he to the priest; 'I have been charitable to the

poor ; I have never been guilty of debauchery with women ; I have discharged the duty of a just and equitable prince ; I have nothing to reproach myself with ; and I can appear before the tribunal of God with confidence.' 'We are all sinners,' replied the almoner ; 'and the most righteous of us all sins seven times a day.' 'When we have done all that is commanded us, we are still unprofitable servants.' We all remarked that he was displeased with this discourse : he repeated more vehemently still : 'No ; I have to reproach myself with nothing ; my people may weep for me as their father.' He preserved silence for some moments, after which he begged us to withdraw. The privy councillors came next ; he made them a long harangue, in which he detailed all the obligations which the country was under to him, and repeated nearly what he had said to the clergyman. He recommended them strongly to have the good of their country always at heart, and to be attached to their new master ; after which he took his last leave of them. He had sufficient strength of mind to take leave of his whole court, from the prime minister to the lowest of his domestics. I was very much affected : but it cannot be denied that there was a good deal of ostentation in his proceedings ; for he carefully pointed out to all of them the care which he had always taken for the good of his country. It will be afterwards seen that he did not think himself dying, and that all this was merely theatrical. At the end of this melancholy ceremony, however, he became extremely weak : when it was over, he begged us to withdraw."—*Memoirs* ii. 245.

The poor old margrave died in a few days, apparently much in the same state.

As our object is rather to delineate the religion and morals of mankind than to describe their wars or enter into their political intrigues, we have been led away from the subject more immediately before us, to which we now return. Professor Ranke is a true German : he is indefatigable in research ; he gives us his authorities from the times of which he writes ; and as we have no means of consulting them, we must assume that he quotes correctly. His object is to lay before his readers the rise and progress of the House of Brandenburg. After a short sketch of the early electors he begins with the grandfather of Frederick the Great, and continues his history through the first ten years of Frederick's reign, concluding with a few chapters on the character of the king, and the improvements introduced in his reign. The laws of Prussia were one great object of his care, and Professor Ranke's account of the legal reforms is highly interesting. In the sixth year of his reign he undertook to draw up a code of civil laws ; and in this task he was assisted by his legal adviser, Samuel Cocceji : this code, however, was soon superseded. Frederick's chief success as a reformer was in the administration of justice,

and to this he always gave the greatest attention. He preferred corporal punishment to fines, as more summary and less injurious to the revenue, as fines tended to impoverish the tax-payers.

He ordered a new scale of fees for legal certificates and bills of sale, which ignorant or corrupt magistrates had raised to an exorbitant price, and which they enforced with the stick. He appointed Cocceji controller-general of the courts, with power to revise all proceedings, and if he thought a cause unjustly decided, to bring it before the king in council. He abolished appeals to the imperial tribunal, and references to foreign lawyers, whom it had been usual for the judges to consult in difficult cases. By Cocceji's advice the office of attorneys was abolished, and the number of barristers limited, and they were obliged to confine their practice to one court. Every precaution was used to prevent delay, as Cocceji declared it was better that the debtor should suffer, than that he should be allowed to ruin his creditor on pretence of protecting himself. (Our law courts might take a hint from this maxim.) An ordinance was also issued calling upon judges and lawyers to make a return of the suits then pending, the length of time they had been before the court, and the reasons which prevented their being decided. The result was as follows:—

"In May, 1747, Cocceji announced with no little satisfaction that a lawsuit between the court of exchequer and certain nobles touching certain boundaries, that had lasted more than 200 years, and filled above seventy volumes of manuscript, had been brought to a conclusion satisfactory to the parties mainly by the industry of Jarriges and Fürst. In this manner they worked during the whole year. In January, 1748, Cocceji reckoned that, during the past year, 1600 old, and 684 new suits had been before the court in Stettin; and 800 old, and 310 new, in Cöslin. All the old cases had been decided; and of the new ones, only 183 remained outstanding in Stettin, and 169 in Cöslin. 'Your Majesty perceives,' exclaimed Cocceji, 'what can be done by courts of justice presided over by learned and upright men.'"—*Ranke*, vol. iii. 371.

In Frederick's arrangements there was one element of the feudal system which he left unchanged, and which has led to half the revolutions of Europe: while he gave distinct privileges to peasants and nobles, he left the impassable barrier between them unbroken. The nobleman must be a land-owner, the peasant a farmer, and the burgher a merchant. The burgher was not allowed to invest his capital in land, for fear of withdrawing it from trade; and the peasant could not become a landed proprietor, because his birth disqualified him from holding the commission of an officer. These distinctions, like those of the patricians and plebeians at Rome, must always give rise to jealousies and dis-

turbances. Mankind have in themselves quite sufficient tendency to split into factions, without legal distinctions to facilitate their doing so. If a law were passed in England that every native of the counties north of the Trent must wear a white hat, and every man to the south a black one, two new factions would be at once created, and the streets of London would be an arena for their trial of strength. Though England possesses an aristocracy, yet the poorest man in the kingdom may rise to become a member of it; and there is no law to prevent a man, whose father was in trade, from rising to be a general officer or a bishop.

To prevent the revival of old disputes, Frederick declared that no nobleman should be called upon to prove his title to his estate further back than 1740; and he endeavoured to give each of his new provinces a government according to the habits and genius of the people. Frederick William had long ago projected improvements in agriculture and commerce, which his son continued with the greatest zeal. Vast tracts of land were drained by his orders, and families who understood spinning were encouraged to settle. He considered it a fortunate discovery, that where his predecessors imported yarn, he imported the men to make it. To his manufacturing families he allotted a house and garden, and the grass of two cows; and reckoned that he could thus settle a thousand families in the year. He encouraged bricklayers who came to Berlin to remain in his dominions, and found employment for them. When he found his colonists troublesome (as a transplanted race usually are), he comforted himself that though the first generation are not worth much, their descendants would improve. The local governments were allowed to reserve to themselves the right of regulating the number of artisans in each branch; and if they increased too much in any given locality, they were sent without appeal into the next province. Thus we have an instance of the singular combination of improvement and despotism which characterizes all the acts of Frederick the Great.

All this, and much more, will be read with interest; it is to us by far the most agreeable portion of the book. We have little knowledge of tactics; and the dry details of skirmishes and engagements, in which the Prussians are one day victorious, and defeated the next, is matter of little curiosity to us. We confess ourselves, therefore, little able to appreciate either the professor's details or the king's narrative of his own exploits; and we feel rather inclined to sympathize with Gil Blas, when he was valet to the old colonel, and thought himself safe, if, in undressing his master and taking off his leg, he could escape with two battles and a siege. Again, political manœuvring is as little interesting

to the generality of readers as military tactics; and it has this disadvantage, that the accounts are less likely to be properly authenticated. What George II. or his advisers desired to do; what Charles VI. or Maria Theresa would have done if they could, and what they pretended to do in order to conceal their real intentions, are to us matters extremely apocryphal, and for this obvious reason,—diplomacy is the art of concealment; the politician has always reversed the principle of the philosopher, and instead of wishing that others should know what he knows, his maxim is,

"Si sciat hoc alter, scire tuum nihil est."

We do not suppose that Sir Robert Walpole or Lord Bute could penetrate the schemes of their German contemporaries, much less is it possible to do so accurately at this day. This must plead our excuse with our readers for departing from our immediate subject, and rather leading them to join us in gossipping with the Princess Wilhelmina, than following the hero through the toils of the camp, or the politician through the mazes of diplomacy. Our professor does both, and to those who prefer such studies as more solid, he will doubtless be more acceptable than lighter reading. We have given but a short sketch; but, as much has been written and published lately, if we have awakened curiosity, our readers will find ample means of gratifying it. The proper study for mankind is man; and he who reads for his own improvement will always turn with pleasure to the history of genius, and the gradual development of the powers of nations and men. Frederick, however, presents another instance of the vanity of all earthly ambition; he lived long, and gained much, but he did so at the expense of almost incredible labour; and he seems to have forgotten that true happiness consists in the knowledge and service of God, and that,

"Give all he can, without Him we are poor,
And with Him rich, take what He will away."

ART. IX.—*The History of the Church of England. By* J. B. S. CARWITHEN, *B.D., late of St. Mary Hall, Oxford, &c. Parts I. and II.* In 2 vols. Oxford: J. H. Parker.

THE real value and importance of Church history consists in its bearing upon the actual state of things in the present day. We find ourselves in the midst of a certain system, amidst institutions, creeds, customs, forms, opinions, and beliefs; and to be enabled to comprehend what we see around us, or to enter into its spirit, we are compelled to inquire how this state of things has arisen. In this point of view there is no part of ecclesiastical history which is valueless to the student. He should be more or less acquainted with the progress of events from the very beginning to the present day. The Reformation was an event of the highest importance, but it was preceded and followed by other events not less important in the history of Christianity, and which deserve equal attention. But how to bring this to bear on the actual composition of an ecclesiastical history is a difficult question. A history should not be a library in itself; and yet there are materials enough to make it equal to a large library: neither should it be a mere sketch, conveying no distinct notions on the most important points. But between these extreme limits a wide field remains for the exercise of the judgment of the ecclesiastical historian in the selection of his materials, and the mode of treating them. In truth, it is impossible to conceive one history adapted to general use. A learned divine will require one kind of book; a student of divinity another; an intelligent layman a third; and an ignorant person a fourth. One requires a book of reference, another an interesting narrative, another a compendious survey of the chief facts, another an instructive series of religious examples. In our literature there are examples enough of works adapted for the use of students, or of general readers; but there are comparatively few works which rise to any thing of a higher character and position—few, we mean, that can properly be called histories. We do not refer to the ancient ecclesiastical writers of England, but to more modern writers, and amongst them we are unable to point out any writer of a general Church history; the efforts of Fox, Burnet, Strype, and Collier—our principal writers—having been restricted to English Church history. Each of the writers we have mentioned has his defects, and Collier alone has attempted

a history of the English Church on a large scale. The value of Collier's work is, however, very great, though its dimensions preclude its general perusal.

Of the lesser works on this subject, which have made their appearance, we are inclined to give the preference, on the whole, to that which we have mentioned at the head of these pages, and which has been carefully edited by the Rev. W. Browell. It consists, it is true, almost wholly of the history of the Reformation, and of subsequent events till the Revolution of 1688; and dismisses the earlier history of the Church with a comparatively brief notice; but there is so much care in the selection of materials, and so cordial an attachment to the Church of England throughout, that we peruse it with satisfaction, even while we sometimes trace an occasional inaccuracy of expression on points connected with the Reformation and the regal supremacy, which would probably have been avoided had the work been written some years later. Such as it is, however, it supplies evidence of much patient and honest research, and, on the whole, may be commended as a faithful guide through the maze of earthly and of higher influences which surround the history of our Church.

And if in former times it has been desirable for Churchmen to be familiar with the fortunes of the Church of God in England, it becomes in the present times more necessary each day we live. It is increasingly incumbent on Churchmen to know the ground on which they stand, and to be prepared to maintain it stedfastly. We have fallen on evil days. We have seen the old hereditary principles of loyalty to Church and Constitution gradually perishing from their abode in high places, and finding their refuge only amongst those whom the world regards as bigoted and narrow-minded partizans. Those principles which have now fallen from their ascendancy in the State, may have been in some respects imperfect, or narrowed by prejudices arising from peculiar circumstances. But they were the relics, at least, of higher principles—the traditions of times when religion was the great actuating motive of statesmen, sovereigns, nations—when Christian truth was the ensign around which men gathered themselves, ready to sacrifice life and possessions in its cause. But we have fallen on a mercantile age, in which the rulers of this world, and large portions of the communities they rule, are indifferent to moral and religious considerations, except so far as they may be made subservient to the convenience of the world that now is.

The Church is in the midst of the world. It may be corrupted by the world, or persecuted by the world; but it can never be identified with the world. Christ's kingdom upon earth was instituted for specific spiritual purposes, and with a certain

organization and ordinances which render her essentially independent of the rise or fall of earthly kingdoms, and which she is bound to maintain and uphold, whether she be favoured by the "powers that be," or persecuted by them. Be she subject to a Diocletian, or to a Constantine, her duties are still simply and stedfastly to maintain the doctrine which has been delivered to her, without alteration, diminution, or addition, and to act on the plain rules of duty prescribed to her by God Himself.

Now, it is plain that a society like this, guided by a law higher than any human law, and held together by the force of conscience, and by spiritual sanctions only, is a body which has, and always must have, an independent existence; and cannot be, by any possibility, identified with the State, so as to form one of its functions, or aspects, or faculties, or parts. It may influence the State, may pervade every part of the State, may convert the State into a Christian State, so that the State shall be in all its actings under the guidance of the Church's principles; but still the State and the Church, however allied, or however mutually influential on each other, remain distinct in their existences, and one is never absorbed in the other. Even in the Papacy the union of spiritual and temporal powers in one person does not destroy the essential distinctness of the power, as we have recently seen in the separation of the temporal power from the Papacy. It may be a matter of convenience to statesmen to encourage a view such as that of Dr. Arnold, which virtually absorbs the Church in the State, and gives to temporal governors the power of regulating all Church affairs as they please; but a wider and more philosophical view would teach them, that such views never have prevailed widely in any Christian Communion; and, above all, *when the interests of that Communion are injured or assailed by the State.* It might be very convenient for English Statesmen now, if the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity of the Church,—all such, at least, as possess activity and influence, were as subservient to the policy of the minister of the day, in all matters bearing on religion, as Dr. Arnold and his disciples would make them; but it is a *fact*, which is undeniable, that the members of the Church of England have a will of their own on many points, and that it has been found impossible to reduce this body into such a state of pliancy, that it will shape its tenets and doctrines on practical subjects in accordance with those of the State Government. Notwithstanding the union of Church and State in England, it is a fact that the successive Governments of England, for the last twenty years, have been more continually in collision with the Church of England than with any other religious community in the empire. The opposition to such measures as the Emancipation Act of

1829, the attempt to abolish Church rates, the commencement of a latitudinarian or irreligious system of education, the endowment of Romish seminaries, and payment of the Romish priesthood, the admission of Jews to Parliament, has arisen from the Church of England. Now, the Church may have been very wrong and mistaken in all this: we are not saying that she was so—but it is clear, at least, that she is not a mere instrument of the State, deprived of the will or the power to uphold her peculiar principles and objects. She may be defeated in the struggle, or she may succeed in the struggle, but she has an independent existence, and a purpose which is not necessarily accordant with that of the State. And it appears that there is every prospect of increasing collision between these two powers, notwithstanding the efforts of the State to obtain more hold over the Church, by the exercise of its ecclesiastical patronage. That policy will only stimulate the energies of the Church, and if it advance the time-serving or the pliant, will only nerve the resolutions of those who are actuated by higher principles, and more self-denying attachment to the Church as a religious system. It may gain the hollow-hearted: it will never reduce to silence and compliance the earnest and the true-hearted,—and this will be discovered eventually by the State.

It is useless for the State to attempt to tie down the Church into absolute subserviency to whatever State policy may require—even if that policy be injurious to the Church's spiritual and temporal interests. Dissenters in England, Presbyterians in Scotland, Romanists in Ireland, Protestantism in Germany, Romanism in France, are all in frequent collision with the temporal powers,—though in some cases in alliance with those powers, and, in Germany and France, entirely dependent upon them. Nothing can be more completely dependent on the State than the Roman Catholic communion in France, and yet nothing can well exceed its obstinacy in resisting the will of the State on educational questions. In Russia alone is there a perfect alliance of Church and State, without any collisions that we ever hear of. But why is this? It is because the State is most rigidly orthodox, and most careful never to offend the religious principles of the Clergy and people. The Russian emperor is able to rule the Russian Church, because he is its most attached follower, and because he promotes its interests on all occasions. Were he to take a different course, his absolute power in Church and State would be shivered to atoms;—he would be dethroned.

The Reformation gave to the State in England powers in relation to the Church which it did not previously possess; and while these powers were exercised in a spirit of fidelity—while the State *acted* on the principle which alone gives it authority

over the Church, that Christian sovereigns are supreme in religious matters over *all classes* of their subjects—all went on peaceably. But the State, having *abdicated and denied its own supremacy* in spiritual matters by permitting, and even encouraging Dissent and Romanism, its position is altered; and the powers which it possesses over the Church by mere law or force, will not suffice to preserve its moral influence, or to ensure harmony of action. Where the State is surrounded by various religious communions, and acts on the avowed principle of impartiality and abstinence from interference with the internal arrangements of sects, it can only effectually maintain its influence, by either acting in all cases on the principle of impartiality, and permitting the most numerous denomination of its subjects not to feel itself the most unjustly dealt with, or else it should act firmly, vigorously, and avowedly, in connexion with some one religious communion. It should either give to the Church of England her Convocation with all its powers, secure the nomination of efficient bishops, and leave the Church at liberty to complete and carry out her organization,—or else it should take its stand by the side of the Church of England, and withhold all encouragement to Romanism and Dissent. Give the Church her constitutional rights which are now withheld, and she will not feel the same jealousy at encouragement being held out to others, who have been emancipated from State control in their religious concerns.

The present relations of the Church of England to the State are in a most unsatisfactory state. The feeling is increasing and growing amongst all earnest-minded men, that a re-adjustment of these relations must be attempted. It is felt that the highest interests of the Church are most seriously compromised by the alterations which have taken place in our ecclesiastical constitution, and in our temporal constitution,—the combined effect of which is to give to alien, and even hostile principles, an influence over the Church of England, which is in direct violation of all the conditions on which the Reformation was commenced, and from which the royal or State supremacy derives its origin.

If we seek the foundation of the supremacy claimed by states or princes over the Christian Church, it is altogether founded, as a matter of *Christian* principle, on *examples* derived from the history of the Old Testament; but then, in all these examples, the sovereign power or State was itself *religious*. It made profession of belief in the one true God; its actions were intended for the promotion of his honour and glory. It was only on this assumption that Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth claimed the supremacy over the Church. That supremacy was a right claimed, in virtue of *Christian government*, to exercise supreme

control over the Christian Church, for its own good. The supposition that sovereigns or states can have any divine right to hold spiritual rule over the Church, except for the purpose of promoting its spiritual good, is absurd. The authority of the State in religious matters is one which involves a distinct positive duty to God,—a direct *spiritual* duty. In proportion as a State claims authority in spiritual matters, so does it become charged with *spiritual* responsibilities. If it exercises spiritual authority for *mere temporal ends*, its dominion is altogether without religious right: it is an unhallowed profaner of God's temple: it is placing "the abomination of desolation" in the midst of the holy place.

Such *was* not—*could not* have been—the intention of any one of those godly men who rescued this land from papal usurpation and mediæval superstition. Nothing could be more sophistical, or more unjust, than to quote the opinions of Cranmer, of Parker, of Laud, or of any other eminent divines, since the Reformation, in favour of the regal supremacy, without, at the same time, stating that, if they held the State to have authority in religious matters, they invariably held that there was a correlative *religious duty;* that the State possessed authority in religious matters *for the very purpose of maintaining religion, of repressing false religion, of promoting the spiritual welfare of the Church.* The Church of England has never recognized a supremacy in any other sense. The sovereigns of England, from the Reformation onwards, for a century and a half, never claimed a supremacy of a different kind: they invariably acted on the principle of their supremacy involving necessarily certain *duties.* They may, or may not, have acted wisely in the discharge of those duties; but they practically exercised their supremacy till the time of King William III., in suppressing errors and schisms, in nominating the most fitting persons to ecclesiastical preferments, and in giving encouragement to the Convocations of the Church of England, on all important occasions, to correct and reform all that was amiss.

Here was a *bonâ fide* exercise of the supremacy, exactly consistent with the principles of the Reformation, and with the grounds and examples on which the supremacy was claimed. This was precisely the course taken by the Christian emperors in the early Church; this was the course of the religious kings mentioned in the Old Testament, as far as the general principle was concerned.

But then, since that period, the State has altogether changed its view and its position. The State now not merely tolerates, but in every way encourages, errors, and schisms, and heresies. It has *abdicated* its claim to supreme authority in religious

matters as far as the Romanists, the Wesleyans, Independents, Baptists, and all other sectarian bodies are concerned. Over this part of the population it claims no religious supremacy, though it tolerates, and, as far as possible, encourages them. So that the State, while claiming supremacy in religious matters, in the same style as Henry VIII. or Elizabeth, affirms, on the other hand, that it has no divine right of the kind, or else refuses to fulfil the *duties* which are involved necessarily in any such right.

If then it be objected to any member of the Church of England that he is bound by the principles of the Church to admit the supremacy of the State or sovereign in religious matters, we DENY that he is bound by the principles of the Church of England to admit the doctrine of *a supremacy involving no duty to maintain the truth, and none to discountenance and repress error.* We deny that any such doctrine has ever been taught by the Church of England. We are quite ready to acknowledge a supremacy involving high religious duties to God, and to the Church of God; but we reject, as contrary to the Church of England, and to Christianity itself, the doctrine of a supremacy exercised *without reference to Christian duties*,—duties to God, duties to pure religion, duties to holiness, duties to all the high spiritual ends and purposes for which Christianity exists. Therefore, we reject and abhor the doctrine of the State supremacy as it is now regarded and acted on by statesmen, lawyers, and politicians; while we receive it with the fullest approbation in the sense in which it is understood by the Church of England, was claimed by the sovereigns of England of former times, and was acknowledged by our divines.

To statesmen and politicians, too generally, the Church is a mere State machinery for the preservation of habits, of morality, and decency. They are wholly unconscious of any higher object and end: the Church is merely for *this* world. On these grounds it is sometimes supported by men who are absolutely without belief. In other cases it is regarded as a mere creature of the State for certain purposes of a moral kind.—This is the statesman's view.

But the Church of England takes altogether a different view; it knows nothing of its State incorporation for promoting ends of State polity; it only recognizes its Christian responsibilities; it derives its graces and gifts from God; it believes itself to be founded by God, and solely and singly for the purpose of doing God's work on earth, and promoting *his* kingdom in the world. Every member of the Church of England feels this, and acknowledges it, to a greater or less extent.

Here, then, is a wide contrast between the principles of the ruling powers of these days, and the principles of the Church of England, and of their own predecessors in former times.

On looking at the present aspect of things, and comparing it with that which existed when the Reformation took place, we must acknowledge that the supremacy which is acknowledged to exist in the State has become *a theory:* it is no longer in existence as a fact. We acknowledge the sovereign to be supreme in all causes, and over all persons; but we know that he has long ceased to be so: that he has relinquished his rights at the passing of the Toleration Act, of the Emancipation Act, of the Test and Corporation Acts; and on twenty occasions since. Therefore, all we can say is, that the Church recognizes in the State a hypothetical supremacy which the State has abdicated; and hypothetical duties, which the State has long ceased to fulfil. Under these circumstances, the supremacy only exists in books, and in language. As a real operating principle it is gone; its adjuncts, institutions, and consequences remain to us; but the principle from which they originated, and which can alone give them a reasonable foundation, has expired. It is true that statesmen, whenever it may suit their convenience, appeal to the supremacy of the Crown, acknowledged by the Church of England, as justifying their acts; but such appeals do not prove that the supremacy, in the Christian sense—the sense of the Church of England—is still in existence, or that it is recognized by those who appeal to it. The kind of supremacy claimed by mere politicians is a counterfeit supremacy,—a mere substitute of their own,—of which the Church of England knows nothing.

And having advanced thus far, the question arises, What are we to do? What is the Church of England to do under this altered state of things? Are we to sit still, and, contenting ourselves with the discharge each of our own duties within our private spheres, to leave it to the Providence of God to carry on the course of events as seemeth Him best? We should say so, under ordinary circumstances; but there are critical and important times in the world's history, when general interests are so deeply involved or imperilled, that it is impossible, consistently with a sense of responsibility to God, and of charity to our neighbour, to remain thus passive. Extraordinary dangers in themselves are a call to private individuals to step out of their ordinary course of action; extraordinary evils justify such measures. It was thus that the Reformation arose. Had men then remained always in their private sphere of action, there would have been no Reformation. We do not pretend to compare the present state of things to that which existed at the period of

the Reformation; but, assuredly, there is much to oppress the Christian heart with a sense of peril to the best interests of the Church.

Is the Church to be made in fact what unbelieving politicians represent it—a mere engine of State policy? Or is it, as we ourselves wish, to be the faithful minister of God, in training up men in habits of obedience to God in the first place, and to the king as God's minister in the next place? Is it to be reduced as much as possible into the state of a mere machine, dependent on Government? or is it to exercise the healthful freedom which it possesses by God's institution, by immemorial inheritance, and by the law of the land? Is it to be guided by holy, devoted, heavenly-minded pastors; or is it to be given up to the sway of worldly, self-seeking, luxurious, and time-serving men, whose first object is themselves; their second, their political party; and their third, their duty to God and his Church?

Such are the questions which are forced upon us by the present state of things, in which the prerogatives of the State claimed and conceded on the assumption of that State's being religious, and having religious objects principally in view, have devolved into the hands of those who are led by the circumstances in which they find themselves placed, to use those prerogatives without any religious principle whatever, but with merely worldly and political objects. Now this, we say, is a state of things that no conscientious and thoughtful churchman can remain satisfied with, or under which he can remain quiescent. He may be subjected to blame as "an agitator," or a needless disturber of what is working well enough. But he should remember, that such imputations are sure to arise whenever any high and generous work is undertaken; and he should learn to disregard all such discouragements, from whatever quarter they may arise. In this case we may surely say with David, "Is there not a cause?"

In the first place, when we look to the suppression of our Synods and Convocations, surely we must say, that a great injury has been done to the Church, by their total suppression for so long a time. One great injury has been, the transferring of all ecclesiastical reform and regulation from the regular representative body of the Church of England to the House of Commons, which was never a good legislature on such subjects, and which has for the last twenty years become obviously and notoriously unfit, from its including religionists of all kinds. Here is an immense evil. Legislation on the most important subjects is virtually at an end. The Church has no power of adaptation to the circumstances of the times. The fact of her being thus deprived of her rights, is made an unceasing argument against her by her ene-

mies. Romanists and dissenters are always arguing against her on this ground amongst others, as a mere State institution. This suppression of synods is, therefore, in all ways injurious to the Church. And, if there be objections on the part of statesmen, or of the Hierarchy to convocation in its present form, why, we would ask, has no attempt been made to improve the system? We can understand this, of course, in the case of the temporal government, which is unwilling to give any liberty to the Church as a general rule. But why have not the Bishops of our Church ever sought to restore the convocation in an improved form, if they have not been satisfied with its present composition? We fear that we cannot acquit the Hierarchy in times past, of a very great and serious mistake in this respect. We know that timidity is the besetting sin of many men in high places in the Church—a timidity which has checked and chilled what was good, while it may have prevented also what was evil.

However this may be, it is evident that the time is come in which, on no account or pretext whatever, or in deference to no authority whatever, should churchmen refrain from seeking fairly, temperately, and perseveringly for the restoration of their rights of assembling together in synod, which the law of God, the usage of seventeen hundred years, and the law of the land give them. Whatever be the cause of the impediment, it ought to be well and vigilantly sifted, and the Church should respectfully but most earnestly call on the authorities in Church and State, to remedy the abuse under which we are suffering, and to give to our spiritual and legal rights their full, and fair, and unshackled exercise.

It should be to us a matter of indifference *who* may be opposed to the assertion of these claims. They are claims which we ought not to put aside for any fear or favour of man, or shrink from asserting in the face of any amount of discouragement. They are claims so obviously founded in right, in common sense, and even in the sense of justice and fairness which all Englishmen cherish, that we feel assured of success, if there be a sufficient amount of perseverance and of energy.

We must now pass on to another great and growing evil. We allude to the absolute power possessed by statesmen, who may be wholly irreligious, in the appointment of the Bishops of the Church of England. The Prime Minister of the day, whoever he may be, whether he be Whig, or Tory, or Radical, or Protectionist, or Free-trader—be he a believer in Christianity or a disbeliever, a scoffer or a mere worldling, a heretic or schismatic,a latitudinarian or virtual dissenter—is invested now with absolute power in the appointment of Bishops. It is true that the theory, and doctrine,

and law of the Church reclaims against such a monstrous position. It is true that the Church supposes the nominations of Bishops to be made by an orthodox sovereign; and the persons nominated, to be liable to examination at their confirmation by the Metropolitan. But though this shows that the Church is right in her principles and her laws, it does not afford any real protection to her, against the intrusion of men of unsound opinions into her episcopate—men of principles adverse to her own. According to the present system, a minister might appoint men inclined to Romanism, if he were disposed to promote the Romanizing of the Church. He might appoint men of latitudinarian or rationalistic principles, if he were inclined to liberalize the Church, and to promote the alteration and liberalizing of our doctrines. He might appoint time-serving, and worldly, and complaisant men, if he wished to deprive the Church of influence, and reduce it to a mere tool of the State. He might appoint men without merit of any kind; men without experience in parochial duty; men unqualified in every way; and thus, looking only to the votes which he may command in the House of Lords or Commons, might utterly neglect the interests of the Church and of Religion. He might appoint leaders of religious parties, in order to promote divisions in the Church, or to ingratiate himself with certain parties. All this he might do; and there is no practical remedy at present. The most unfit men may be appointed. The best qualified may be wholly set aside. There is no obligation to appoint well-qualified persons, or even to seek for qualifications. An unfit or incompetent general or admiral will never be appointed to command an army or fleet; but the minister may appoint whom he pleases to be a Bishop; and then, if his nomination be opposed, may complain of an interference with the royal prerogative!

Now this is not a state of things in which the Church of England can acquiesce. It is not a position in which any Church ought to be placed. When Henry VIII. received, by Act of Parliament, that right which his predecessors had *not always and in all cases* possessed, of appointing Bishops—it was never supposed that the power thus given, would pass from the crown into the hands of the minister of the crown, nominated by a parliament, including all sects of sectarians and infidels amongst its members. It was yielded by the Parliament and conceded by the Church, on the assumption that the Crown was to be *bonâ fide* sovereign, and *bonâ fide* of the same religion as the Church. The sovereign power is now swayed by *ministers* who are not necessarily of the same religion as the Church. The conditions on which the Church assented to the arrangements in the time of Henry VIII.,

have been lost sight of. It is, therefore, necessary that new arrangements should be sought for.

It may be said in reply to this, that the present system of ministerial appointment has *worked well;* that much practical good has resulted. We deny that it has worked well. It is not necessary to state particulars; but we do say that the Church has had reason, in too many ways, to feel that it *has not worked well;* and that we have many reasons to complain of the operation of the existing order of things. It is needless for us to state particulars: they are too widely felt and known. Therefore, without dwelling on an invidious branch of the subject, let us say here, as we do without doubt or hesitation, that no true Churchman can any longer acquiesce in the present state of things as regards the *absolute* power claimed by statesmen to appoint bishops, without reference to their qualifications; and that it behoves Churchmen to adopt such steps as are in their power, for the firm, but temperate, and persevering agitation of the moderate and just claims of the Church, for protection of her highest and most sacred interests in this respect. The contest ought to be pressed on the ground of common justice, of reason, of equity, and of religion; and this, without any appeals to principles beyond the understanding of the mass of the people, will, we trust, eventually lead to an alteration in the law on this subject, and, in the mean time, may, at least, lead to some alteration in the practice.

Another subject on which the Church of England has had reason to complain that her highest interests have been either neglected or made subservient to merely political considerations, is the due increase of her ministry—not merely of the second, but of the *first* order of the ministry. The Church has for a long series of years been unanimous in the opinion, that some considerable increase in the number of Bishops is necessary; and yet that increase has been withheld, under one plea or another. What is it that now prevents the increase of the Episcopate? It is simply this,—that there is a certain small party in the House of Commons, who are bent on opposing vigorously every increase of the Episcopate, on the same basis as the present Episcopate. That is, they will not have any more Bishops appointed with large incomes, and temporal dignities. Whether this party might not be divided by a proposal to appoint suffragan Bishops with smaller incomes, is a question which might fairly be asked, if there were any party amongst men in high station that was in earnest on the subject. But, as it does not seem that amongst politicians there is any strong feeling in favour of the measure, we have only to say, that if the Church of England wishes to see her Episcopate properly enlarged, so that Bishops shall be brought

in contact with the Clergy and laity in their pastoral capacity; the Church must not depend upon any set of men, any political party, or even on its own heads in the House of Lords, who abstain habitually from bringing forward any measures on behalf of the Church; she must look to herself, her own energies, her own perseverance, her own firm, and persevering, and temperate expressions of opinion, to win for her those benefits which ought to have been granted without importunity, but which importunity *alone* will win.

In the Session of Parliament which is before us, we trust that the members of the Church of England will make their voices heard, and will not refrain from the fullest and most open expression of their objects and their wishes. We shall require to keep a vigilant eye on the proceedings of various parties, and to resist those measures which we deem injurious to religion in general, and to those of the Church of England. In all probability the proposal will again be made to go a step further in the course of unprincipled concession to religious error, by granting political power to the Jews. We are bound, as members of the Church of England, and, therefore, as holding the duty of the State to uphold the truth and to discourage error—we are bound, we say, as members of the Church of England, to oppose and resist this, or any other similar measure of encouragement to what is evil.

We shall again have to confront the odious and disgusting agitation which seeks to dissolve the obligations of the table of prohibited degrees, and to throw all principles on that most important subject into confusion. We have to bestir ourselves, so that petitions shall issue from every parish in the land against this detestably impure and most audacious attempt. We have to require that, at least, the Church of England may not be subject to the gross tyranny implied in preventing her from punishing those of her ministers who should presume to celebrate marriages which she in her canons denounces as Incest.

We shall, perhaps, further have to watch over measures introduced for the reform or alteration of the Cathedral system. We shall have to defend the rights of the Cathedral bodies, but without defending the abuses which have arisen in them. We shall have to resist the needless appropriation of their revenues to objects altogether alien to the intention of their founders—to point out the injustice of extinguishing the Cathedral offices instead of giving to those offices that care of souls, and those other important and onerous duties which were originally connected with them—to urge the propriety of bringing the members of chapter into permanent residence, and annexing to those offices the poorly-endowed parishes of the Cathedral cities, and other im-

portant functions. In such efforts we have no doubt that we shall have the concurrence and aid of a considerable part of the Hierarchy.

It will be our duty to watch over the insidious advances of the temporal government to gain possession of the whole education of the land—to take from the Clergy the control they now exercise—and, finally, to impress its own latitudinarian bias on the whole.

Such are the objects now before the Church of England, and which, we trust, the faithful, zealous, and resolute sons and servants of that Church are prepared vigorously and perseveringly to press, without regard to persons, or parties—and alike through evil report and good report. Their way is plain before their face: they have objects before them incontestably good and right—claims founded in plain and palpable justice, and which only need to be known in order to secure general acceptance.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS,

ETC.

1. A Sunset Reverie. 2. Mangin's Outline of the Constitution and History of the Church. 3. The Order for Prime. 4. Peile's Annotations on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians; The Second Epistle to the Corinthians; and the Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians. 5. Copy of a Correspondence between the Lord Bishop of Sydney and the Governor of New South Wales; and Copy of a Correspondence between Dr. M'Hale and the Poor-Law Commissioners of Ireland. Sessional Papers. 6. Alford's Greek Testament. 7. Jackson's Sinfulness of Little Sins. 8. Cotterill's Seven Ages of the Church. 9. Letters to a Lady: from the German of Baron Humboldt. 10. Gray's Earth's Antiquity. 11. Evans' First Revelations of God to Man. 12. Houghton's Examination of Calvinism. 13. Wilde's Closing Years of Dean Swift's Life. 14. Soyer's Modern Housewife. 15. Developments of Protestantism; and other Fragments. 15. Evans' Leicestershire Words, Phrases, and Proverbs. 17. Ewart's Lessons for Writing from Dictation. 18. Judith. A Romance from the Apocrypha. 19. Francis' Chronicles and Characters from the Stock Exchange. 20. Ramsay's Life and Literary Remains of Barbara Hofland. 21. Best, On Catechising. 22. Garratt's Scripture Symbolism. 23. H. Sherlock's edition of Sherlock's Practical Christian, with Life by Bishop Wilson. 24. Reflections, Meditations, and Prayers on the Life and Passion of our Lord. 25. Thorpe's Plain Truths on Important Subjects. 26. Kelly's Fourth Series of Lectures on Subjects connected with Prophecy. 27. Trevilian's Letter on the Antichristian Character of Free-Masonry. 28. Williams' Seven Sermons on Various Occasions. 29. Report to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, with Notes of Returns, &c., on the Suppression of Intemperance. 30. Moral Tales. 31. The Last Sleep of the Christian Child. 32. Sharpe's London Magazine. 33. John's History of Spain for Young Persons. 34. Froude's Nemesis of Faith. 35. Magnay's Rest. An Episode. 36. The Pastor of Welbourn and his Flock. 37. Poole's History of Ecclesiastical Architecture in England. 38. Bernays' Life of Christians during the first three Centuries of the Church. 39. Smith's Devout Christian. 40. Bowdler's Few Words of Family Instruction. 41. Forbes' Danger of Superficial Knowledge. 42. Harrison's Prophetic Outlines of the Christian Church and the Antichristian Power. 43. Davidson's Introduction to the New Testament. 44. Short Conclusions from the Light of Nature. 45. Newton's Antichrist; and The Flight of the Apostate. Poems. 46. Chapters on Deacons. 47. The Theologian and Ecclesiastic; and The Churchman's Companion. 48. The Ten Commandments. 49. Michell's Ruins of Many Lands. A Poem. 50. Cutts' Manual for the Study of the Sepulchral Slabs and Crosses of the Middle Ages; and Buotell's Christian Monuments of England and Wales. 51. Percy's Romanism as it exists at Rome. 52. Harvey's Two Sermons on the Duty and Manner of Keeping the Lord's Day. 53. Sewell's Two Sermons; The Nation, the Church, and the University of Oxford.—Miscellaneous.

1.—*A Sunset Reverie. An Allegory.* London: Masters.

One of those pretty little religious fictions, if the term be held to involve no self-contradiction, which have issued in numbers from the various so-called "schools" within the English Church during the last ten or fifteen years, and of which the one before us, if the last, is certainly not the least. The design of this "Sunset Reverie" is very simple, but it is unambitiously, and, mainly on that account, poetically executed. The "two children Mirth and Earnest," types of the ordinary Christian, and the more devoted child of God, are well contrasted. The

incident of the pursuit of "the king-moth" by Mirth reminds us rather too forcibly of a certain passage in Byron's "Bride of Abydos;" but perhaps the resemblance was unavoidable. The happiest idea, in the whole allegory, we think, is that of "the diamond" fastened on each child's breast by "the Stranger," (our Lord,) the type of the presence of the Holy Spirit. The sun calls forth brilliant colours on these diamonds, giving them the semblance of various precious gems in turn, which are thus happily described:—

"First of all I marked the dark red carbuncle, emblem of the glowing zeal, which was so necessary to sustain their spirits through the weary and toilsome hours that must elapse before the Stranger's return; next, the golden-tinted topaz, whose light, like the gleaming of steel, recalls the sword of the spirit, with which the good fight is fought; then the dark green emerald, suggesting not the least of the Christian graces, hope; the sapphire, type of love; the turquoise, blue as the sky that spreads above them, full of thoughts of heaven; and the amethyst, typical of the calm yet resolute bearing of the soldier's cross."

After this corollary of graces we will not seek to display our critical acumen. It were brushing the butterfly's wing, indeed, or crushing the first spring violet beneath tempest rains, to assume our rod of office here.

II.—*An Outline of the Constitution and History of the Church. In Question and Answer. By the Rev.* S. W. Mangin. London: Masters.

We like this little work much; very much indeed. It was greatly needed, and we thank Mr. Mangin for his very sensible and conscientious performance of his humble task. This catechism is strictly Anglican, and at the same time Catholic, in the best sense. It is thoroughly and unobtrusively orthodox, on all points in dispute, whether betwixt Rome, or Geneva, and ourselves. We only object to the unqualified statement (page 23) that the Church of England is *not* in communion with the Greek Church. Not in communion outwardly, or in a strict and legal sense, we admit; but the two Churches have mutually recognized each other more than once, and, surely, we are spiritually in communion with those with whom and for whom we pray.

The whole arrangement of this little catechism is very happy. The ordering of Church government is rightly traced back to Scripture evidence, in opposition to all, who would teach us, that we must rely merely on tradition for the fundamentals of our Church's discipline or government. Thus, after apostolical succession has been rightly vindicated as proceeding, not primarily

or strictly, from the Apostles, but from our Blessed Lord Himself, and after the distinct offices of bishops, priests, and deacons, have been explained, we find this question and answer:—

"Q. Why are we obliged to believe thus of the Church?
A. Because all this may be proved from Holy Scripture."

The history of the Church is then treated catechetically and with no little felicity. The truth, with regard to the limited effects of Augustine's mission, (which has been so exceedingly overvalued, and which staunch Anglicans, even, too often suffer themselves to dwell on as the virtual origin of our Church,) is resolutely and well maintained in the following simple "Questions and Answers" which must make our last quotation:—

"Q. What was the condition of the western Church in the sixth and seventh centuries?

"A. It was greatly troubled by the barbarous heathen nations from the north of Europe.

"Q. What had been the condition of the British Church?

"A. The Saxons had overrun a great part of the country, and, being heathens, had driven the Christians into the mountains and wild parts of Wales, Devonshire, and Cornwall, *where, as well as in Scotland, the Church continued to flourish.*

"Q. What was the chief bishopric of Britain at that time?

"A. Caerleon, on the river Usk, in South Wales.

"Q. Who came to convert to Christianity the Saxons who had settled in England?

"A. St. Augustine was sent from Rome by Pope Gregory the First.

"Q. When was this?

"A. In the year 596.

"Q. What did he afterwards become?

"A. The first Archbishop of Canterbury.

"Q. *Did the preaching of St. Augustine spread far?*

"A. *No. The conversion of the Saxons by him and his missionaries was confined chiefly to Kent and the south-eastern parts of the country.*

"Q. How was the Church restored in the north-western and midland parts of England?

"A. *Chiefly by British and Saxon missionaries from Iona, an island on the coast of Scotland, and from Lindisfarne, on the coast of Northumberland.*

"Q. Why is it of consequence for us to know this?

"A. Because it shows that we do not owe the truth of Christianity, or the constitution and rites of our Church, to missionaries from Rome."

We observe that Mr. Mangin refers to Dr. Wordsworth's "Theophilus Anglicanus," and the works of Mr. Palmer and Mr. Churton, together with a short history on the list of the Christian Knowledge Society, as his chief authorities. He has discharged

his task both modestly and courageously, and has furnished the Church with a valuable little manual, which she will do well to employ both in private teaching and in her schools.

Since we have named schools, we shall here take occasion to observe, that the present unjustifiable insolence of certain State-authorities in attempting to subject our Church schools to far more stringent and offensive regulations than they would venture to impose on heretics and schismatics, only inflicts the due punishment on us, for having ever submitted, for a moment, to be placed on the same level with teachers of falsehood. We hold, that if the Church is a State Church (as in a certain sense we admit it to be) the State must be a Church State also, and has therefore no right to countenance, far less promote, the dissemination of error and heresy. If men are to be paid by the nation to teach Romanism and every other form of dissent to children, why should they not be paid for teaching adults as well? A great principle, almost the greatest of principles, was thus weakly abandoned, for the sake of an apparent, now too obviously only apparent, gain. Let dissenters learn, if they will, in the Church and State schools, being exempted from attendance during the hours of religious instruction,—that is, if their parents so desire it! This is the only really feasible plan of national education at all consistent with sound principle; and sooner or later it must be adopted, if we are not to follow in the wake of foreign nations, and become subject to the despotism of an infidel democracy. Whilst we say this, we are far from denying, that the State, being still ostensibly a Church State, which recognizes the Church as spiritual Mother of the land, adopts her forms of prayer, and virtually elects her bishops, should have some influence in our Church schools, and that the existence of her commissioners, whether lay or clerical, might prove of no little service to both Church and State: but, there is a canker at the very root of the present arrangement which must needs corrupt the tree. It is this,—that by the very construction of our scheme of national education, in the most manifest and even absurd inconsistency with other facts, the Church is only treated as one sect among many, and is yet apparently expected to reap this *advantage* from her alliance with the State, that that State shall not give her a farthing for her schools without controlling and shackling her, while it fees Romanists and other schismatics without preferring any claim whatsoever to supremacy. Surely this state of things cannot be expected to last. The Church will make a strong move sooner or later, and when she does so, it will be towards a far nobler goal than her adversaries at present anticipate,—a goal, if we mistake not, which she is destined to attain.

III.—*The Order for Prime.* London: Masters.

THIS is a rather mysterious publication. No explanation whatsoever is prefixed, so that we only surmise, it may be intended for use in a sisterhood. Even there we should object to "the lesson for the day" consisting ordinarily of a single verse, unless the sisterhood were expected to assemble also at their parish church. The presence of a priest is, we see, assumed in this "Order for Prime," which consists of the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, certain ejaculations and responses, certain Psalms, the hymn "Jam lucis orto sidere" in an English version, "a lesson" (as above described), and two or three collects. In all this there is nothing objectionable; but we do not quite like the absence of explanatory matter.

IV.—1. *Annotations on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, designed chiefly for the use of Students of the Greek Text. By* THOMAS WILLIAMSON PEILE, *D.D., &c. &c.* London: 1848.

2. *Ditto, 2 Corinthians.* 1848.

3. *Ditto, Galatians—Colossians.*

THE first instalment of the author's promised body of annotations on the Apostolical Epistles, namely, those on the Epistle to the Romans, was reviewed in this journal at the time of its appearance; and we now have before us three portions in continuation named at the head of the article, completing the second volume.

Among the various matters of reflection and disquisition connected with the New Testament, how scanty a share of consideration has probably been bestowed on the particular forms, under which divine wisdom has therein provided documents for the perpetual edification of the Church! An announcement of the existence of a collection of writings, forming a sole and authoritative depositary of a new religion, divinely communicated to man, would hardly call forth an anticipation of its not embracing a single document primarily and simply didactic; yet such is the case with the New Testament. When we have set aside one prophetical and five historical books, the remaining writings are epistolary; that is to say, not merely missives, but in general marked by all the proper features of epistolary communication. Let us glance for a moment at some of these. The pen of the writer of an epistle may be called into action by circumstances which he need not describe, or be influenced by the knowledge of particulars respecting those whom he addresses, of which others possess no direct information; he may borrow terms from previous communications, oral or written; he may employ insinuation, irony, or sarcasm, which find their proper response only in the consciousness of those to whom they are immediately

directed. In respect of these, and other kindred characteristics, the apostolic epistles present the true epistolary type, though in different degrees. In some the epistolary traits are comparatively slight, as in that to the Ephesians, which was probably circular; while the first of St. John scarcely belongs to this class of writings at all, but offers a peculiar difficulty of its own in the way of clear and certain apprehension, namely, in being essentially polemical, without stating explicitly the errors which it opposes, or descending to argument and formal refutation.

The operation of writings thus characterized, when forming so considerable a portion of the depositary of a professed revelation, is sufficiently clear in one respect, in the palpable and stubborn evidence of authenticity which they present. May we not venture a step further, and recognize in documents of this particular form an instrument for keeping alive continual scrutiny in the pursuit of a more complete and exact apprehension of their various parts; so that even the literal student should not be left to the necessity of simply resting upon the results of exhaustive labour on the part of his predecessors, but should have opportunity at least for the wholesome exercise of searching, sifting, and pondering, with the prospect of some solid repayment for his toil.

From this very nature, then, the text of the Apostolic Epistles, as respects accurate exposition, still invites, rather than repudiates, an accession of labourers: it is not yet a soil reduced by fair exhaustion to a perpetual fallow; not a mine which denies to fresh adventurers even the hope of some vein undetected or worked but partially. Herein do undertakings like the present find abundant justification, and establish a claim for high approval and encouragement when successfully executed.

Strictly to review a body of annotations, by an actual process of criticizing, is, at the best, an awkward feat, being, in fact, a writing of notes upon notes: we shall therefore endeavour, instead, to select such specimens as will enable our readers, without our aid, to form an opinion of the whole.

The author does not disdain the aid of others. Interwoven with his own matter will be found, as occasion offers, a scholium from Chrysostom or Theophylact, a vigorous comment of Calvin, or the note of some recent interpreter: but it is to that portion which is due to his own self-relying originality, justified, of course, by due learning and ability, that we rather invite attention; and our extracts have been made accordingly:—

"1 Cor. ii. 7—9. '*We publish wisdom*, he had said, *yet a wisdom not of this world*—and now he adds, still careful (see ch. iv. 22) to convey his instruction in such terms as best might engage the attention of his Grecian converts; *but what we publish is a recondite scheme of*

Divine wisdom up to this time kept back from mankind—God's *esoteric* teaching, as it were; and, as such, to be distinguished from that *wisdom of God*, referred to in ch. i. 21, which (see Rom. i. 19) the Creator has manifested to all his creatures—*which God fore-ordained, before all time, unto our glory: καίτοιγε ἀλλαχοῦ φησίν*—observes Chrysostom on this verse—*εἰς δόξαν ἑαυτοῦ· ἑαυτοῦ γὰρ ἡγεῖται δόξαν τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν.*'

"1 Cor. iii. 14, 15. '*If a man's work, which he hath built thereon, shall endure* (read *μενεῖ*) the fiery trial which is to try it, *he will receive a reward* (ch. ix. 17. Matt. x. 41, 42. Dan. xii. 3). *If a man's work shall be burnt down, he will have lost his labour; and* say that *he shall himself escape, yet will it be, as it were, out of the midst of* (by going through) *fire.*'

"1 Cor. vii. 21. '*Art thou a slave, and hast been called* to be a Christian? *then* (comp. James i. 9) *care not* for thy servitude—*yet, if thou hast it in thy power to become free*, by all means *prefer to use that power;* comp. ch. ix. 12. 15.—*for that slave who has been called* to be (ver. 15) *in the Lord, is the Lord's freedman: in like manner as the free, from the time when he was called* (*ἐπεὶ ἐκλήθη*), *has been Christ's bondman.* Bondman, I say! for such, in truth, ye are.—*At a costly price have ye been purchased* (1 Pet. i. 18, 19); *cease now to regard yourselves as bound unto men* (comp. ch. iii. 23. vi. 20. Matt. xxiii. 8—11). In short—*every one, under what outward designation* (ver. 20) *he has been called, Brethren, in that let him* be well content to *abide with God.*'

"Gal. iii. 5. '*He, then, that is liberally giving you of his* Spirit (Luke xi. 13. 2 Cor. ix. 10. 1 Pet. iv. 11), *and* for the further confirmation of your faith *is working miracles among you, is it in consideration of prescribed duty done* (Law reduced to Practice) *that He so dealeth with you? or* is it not *in consideration of faith shown in hearing?* (1 Sam. iii. 9) *even as Abraham*, we know from Gen. xv. 6, *believed God, and had it credited unto him for righteousness. Ye perceive, therefore, that men of faith, they are* in the truest sense *sons of Abraham; and that it was in the foresight of the fact of God's absolving the nations on the plea of faith* (Rom. iii. 26), *that the Scripsure,* IN THEE SHALL ALL NATIONS BE BLESSED, *did long before now preach the Gospel unto Abraham: so that* (or, *and so*) *it is they which be of faith, that are blessed with* (even as, like sons, they walk in the steps of) *faithful Abraham;* Rom. iv. 12.'

"Eph. iv. 16. '*In dependence upon whom all the Body, closely and compactly held together by every ministering* joint and *ligament, with each separate part at work in its due measure, is making its increase* (of body =) *as a Body, in such form as to be continually building up itself in love. Διὰ πάσης ἁφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας* cannot, without inversion of the order in which Greek nouns are commonly placed in regimen, be rendered (as our translators have understood it) *by the contribution of every joint*—not to say that, in this sense, the clause would not connect so well with the preceding participles, to which it of right belongs.'

"Eph. vi. 24. '*Incorruptibly, immortally*, and so *unendingly*, eternally—'εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς αἰωνίου, ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος, ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ πνεύματος ἁγίου:' *Polyc. Mart.* 14. ap. Grinf. *Scholl. Hellen. in l.*—would seem to have been the terms in which the holy Apostle conceived of that grace of Christian charity or love, which is to survive the tomb, and on which the imperishable crown of the Christian's final acceptance with God is suspended: compare 2 Tim. iv. 8; James i. 12; 1 Pet. v. 4; Rev. ii. 10. But, till 'this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality,' not even of the most spiritually-minded Christian, not even (Phil. iii. 12) of the holy Apostle himself, can it be said that they '*love our Lord Jesus Christ*,' ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ.—Translate therefore: *Grace be with all that love our Lord Jesus Christ*, and abide with them *imperishably! Amen:* and by ἡ χάρις, to be distinguished in this valedictory blessing from χάρις, as found in the customary form of salutation which the Apostles prefix to their Epistles—understand *the grace of salvation* (Tit. ii. 11), or in other words, *their present state of favourable acceptance with Him* (compare Luke i. 28. 30. 66; ii. 40. Acts ii. 47; iv. 33); and that of this the Apostle says, *esto perpetua!*'

"Col. ii. 23. 'For these are things which have a show indeed of wisdom, displaying itself *in fondness for ritual observances, and self-abasement, and afflicting of one's body;* but *are not things to be made of any great account against* (*i. e.* as in themselves opposed to, and incompatible with) *indulgence of the flesh*—which even under the most rigorous asceticism, and under the fairest semblance of devotional piety, has many times in the history of the Church been found to be lurking unmortified and unsubdued.'"

To the annotations on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians is appended an elaborate supplementary note or excursus on Rom. i. 5, and the subject is resumed in another appendix to the second volume. A due consideration and discussion of their contents would furnish matter for a separate article, and one of more than ordinary length. We shall, accordingly, at present attempt no more than a statement of the positions therein maintained, as briefly and clearly as we can.

The author sets out from the words ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολήν, maintaining the recipients of whom St. Paul here speaks, to be not the holders of the Apostolic commission properly so called, but the entire congregation of believers; and that the graciously vouchsafed commission, signified in these words, is ever resident in that undying incorporation. A practical development of the prerogative thus ascribed to the entire body he sees in the transactions of the original churches of Jerusalem and Antioch, recorded in the Acts of the Apostles.

By these positions the author is inevitably committed to the whole question of Apostolical succession. He thereupon contends, that "the Apostles of Christ ordained none that should succeed

them in their peculiar regency of the Gospel kingdom, which was to expire with them;" and, accordingly, that the creation of a diocesan episcopate was a generative act of the various portions of the Church itself; which was possessed, indeed, of a distinctly defined and duly constituted ministry, but had become, or was becoming, fatherless and headless by the demise of the Apostolic college; or, to borrow the author's own illustration, that there was an interposing of the adult Church between her Apostolic fathers and episcopal sons. According to this theory, episcopacy was not a devolution of Apostolic station and function by Apostolic hands, but the Church's self-generated supplement of an inevitable deficiency. The author cites as sharers in this view of the subject, among the ancients, Augustine and Firmilian, and, among moderns, Arnold; the last in the following words: 'Bishops ordaining, *as the organs of the Church* constitute, as I believe, a Church government most true in theory and most excellent in practice. Bishops ordaining *in right of their Apostolical descent*, without reference to the authority of the Church, constitute a lame and inconsistent Popery, false in theory, and in practice inefficient.'

To this theory, in his own elaborate exposition of it, the author invites dispassionate consideration; and on the ground of this challenge, we have given a statement of opinions on ecclesiastical polity, which, however, cannot have our assent. By his own disquisition he could scarcely fail to be led on to another subject of vast practical importance to the well-being of the Church, and inclusively to a question to which attention seems to be daily more and more directed, namely, the restoration or reconstruction of synods in the Church of England.

If there be really resident in the entire body of the faithful such prerogatives as are here assigned to it, it is a most palpable anomaly, that organization for corporate action should in any integral portion be non-existent or effete. Such is the preliminary argument, and the scheme proposed is not simply one of revival, but of reconstruction, and is in several points original. It is professedly modelled after the synod described in Acts xv.

"Would he then adopt this Convocation-model for Christian England? Would we wish to arrest the progressive dismemberment and decay of Church-membership, and to 'stablish, strengthen, settle' the *subjective* revival of 'the spirit of the Church' in our people, by preparing for it a body in which it shall exhibit itself in its *objective* character also—would we be seen, in short, to be 'as a city that is at unity in itself,' a *Church-State*, and not, as the enemy (alas! that we should have given him so much occasion to blaspheme) would invert it, 'a State-Church'—then what was wont to be (and still, though effete and spiritless, survives) as the sole outward form of our meeting as *the*

Church of Christ in this nation, must *die away* from among us; and into our 'Upper House of Convocation' we must admit the ministers, judges, and other great officers of the Crown, into the Lower an adequate representation of elders and lay-brethren in the Lord. Better still, and closer to our pattern would it be, if these two chambers thus enlarged, could be formed into one ecclesiastical synod—one supreme court of spiritual legislature at once, and judicature—the centre of our whole ecclesiastical system, the seat of our Anglo-Catholic ἐπισκοπής, in which the 'Patriarch and Primate of all England' should, *ex officio*, preside as 'Pater patrum et episcopus episcoporum, et alter sæculi sui Jacobus' . . . . Can we doubt that, as its day, so would its strength be? that, its work being 'begun, continued, and ended in God,' His Presence would be with it, His Spirit and His blessing would rest upon it? that the many rills of divine grace, which of late years have been irrigating and invigorating the *individual* Church-life, and activity of our people, being thus collected and concentrated, would be in the heart of this great empire as 'a well of water springing up unto everlasting life.'"

The general question to which this extract relates, is one which, in all probability, must at no very distant period be fairly met, notwithstanding practical difficulties; and every earnest and honest contributor of argument and suggestion has a claim for an open welcome and a candid hearing.

v.—1. *Copy of a Correspondence between the Lord Bishop of Sydney and the Governor of New South Wales.* (Sir Robert Harry Inglis. Mr. Hawes.) *Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 26th July*, 1849. *Sessional Paper, No.* 562.

2. *Copy of a Correspondence between the Most Reverend Dr. M'Hale and the Poor-law Commissioners of Ireland, on the subject of the Chaplaincy of the Tuam Workhouse.* (Sir William Somerville.) *Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 17th July*, 1849. *Sessional Paper, No.* 515.

We commend these papers to the perusal of our readers, if only for the curiosity of the thing. For, certainly, since the accession of King William the Third, nothing "*Simile aut secundum*," has been presented to the British public in the guise of *official documents*.

Nor will they be found barren of entertainment (the *second* series of letters, especially, is equal to a chapter of Miss Edgeworth's or Charles Lever's Irish novels); still less, devoid of instruction. Nay, the lesson they teach is one of very grave import; and to this we desire especially to direct the attention of our parliamentary readers.

For realizing this lesson it will be well to read the two sets of

letters in connexion with each other; and, if possible, also in connexion with a pamphlet to which we drew attention some months ago, entitled "Earl Grey's Circular. A memento." (Rivingtons.) The reader will then be in a position to appreciate the real importance of a seemingly trivial favour neatly conferred, not by the Crown, at least in any manner known to law or usage, but by two great officers of State—the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and the Secretary of the Colonies—upon the Roman Catholic prelates within their respective spheres of administration. He will also be able to judge of the *wisdom* of that concession, by its *fruits*.

We allude of course to the *official* allowance of those prelates' claim to rank, style, and titles, parallel with the respective orders of prelacy within the Established Church. The most important (though not the most edifying or amusing) part of the *fasciculus* No. 1 consists of a becoming and dignified remonstrance from the Lord Bishop of Sydney against the principle, and against, also, the specific operation of this novel creation of dignities within the province of Australia. There, be it known, a certain John Bede Polding, D.D., rejoices, "by the grace of God and of the Holy Apostolic See," to style himself "*Arch*bishop of Sydney." By the *obvious* sense of Earl Grey's rescript, this personage would seem entitled (if that rescript were to be taken as law) to take rank of his lordship, the plain *bishop*, at the court of Her Majesty's colonial representation. The bishop, having learnt from the governor that "there *could not be a doubt* in his excellency's mind that such was the regulation intended to be established by Earl Grey, felt constrained to intimate that until he should learn that "such an arrangement *had been ratified by Her Most Gracious Majesty*," in *which* case he should feel bound to "*presume* that such order of precedence involves nothing of illegality *or departure from the constitution as by law established*," his lordship must "abstain from presenting himself at government-house on public occasions." But he trusted that "his absence on such occasions would be candidly construed, as arising only from a sense of *the indignity which would be cast upon the Church of England*" in his person, should he consent "to assume in his excellency's presence a station different from that which had been heretofore conceded to him." His lordship's impression of that indignity "being so much the stronger, as such alteration in his position would not be the effect of *Her Majesty's pleasure directly* signified, but would be attributable *to the act of a foreign authority*, which would thus be entitled, at its own discretion, and as often as it should think proper, *to supersede every colonial bishop* from the rank assigned to him by our only legitimate sovereign."

Sir Charles Fitzroy very promptly referred this knotty protest to the decision of the Wronghead in Downing-street, praying for a reply before the birth-day levee of this year's May should be *dis*graced by the *absence* of Her Majesty's best and most dignified subject in all Australia. Earl Grey took from the 13th of December to the 9th of January before he could make up his mind for an answer. Yet nothing was easier than to find one. He had only to tell the governor what he himself had told the House of Lords, and what Lord John Russell had told the House of Commons[1]; viz., that the circular despatch made *no* new regulation as to the rank and precedency of colonial Romish prelates; neither did it so, *in terms*, but only by inference, from a false statement of such precedency having been *statutably* conferred upon the Romish prelates in Ireland. He had only to rest in *that* quibble, and let the governor gently down for his *blunder*, and so the whole affair would blow over. But a certain class of characters have, proverbially, short memories. Lord Grey thought he saw a preferable dodge this time. So, forgetting his own and Lord J. Russell's former asseveration, he gravely tells the governor that "according to the *true*(!) construction of *the directions respecting the precedence of Roman Catholic prelates conveyed in his despatch of the* 20*th Nov.*, 1847; *the bishop* (*sic*) of the Church of England in New South Wales (as if there were not *four* of them) ought to have precedence of the Roman Catholic *Arch*bishop." This discovery, lest it should puzzle poor Sir Charles Fitzroy too much, is thus elucidated: *The title of Archbishop* conveys *in itself* no necessary precedence over *that of bishop*. So his lordship "apprehends (!)."

"It is a title given by way of distinction to *metropolitan* bishops . . . But the Bishop of Sydney is, in substance, a metropolitan, *as much*(!) as the Roman Catholic Archbishop, being so constituted by the terms of the instruments in which his office and those of the other Australian bishops are conferred. His rank, therefore, in his own Church answers to that of the latter *dignitary*, although his title be not the same: and he *would* rank, *consequently*, above the latter, *according to the rules laid down* (by Lords Grey and Clarendon, to wit) respecting prelates *of the same order in the two Churches.*"

We give this precious conundrum *in extenso;* because it contains the whole pith of Lord Clarendon's and Lord Grey's theory and practice. Their object is to establish, as they foolishly term it, "*social equality*," between the "two Churches." But this involves "*ecclesiastical* equality" also; and not only ecclesiastical, but *legal* equality besides. The pope's "instrument" conferring

[1] Vide Earl Grey's Circular, &c.

metropolitan functions upon Dr. Polding, is thus declared by the queen's minister just as valid as Her Majesty's letters patent. The "*pas*" hereon is to be just saved to the Established Church —as "the most favoured sect," we suppose—but the "*pas*," only. The suffragan bishops of Australia must yield precedence to the pope's *metropolitans*, as many as he may please to constitute!

This utter confusion of all ecclesiastical and all legal principle and practice will, we trust, at length, be brought before the notice of Her Majesty. The Bishop of Sydney will hardly, we think, fall into the trap set for him, and, by accepting this tricky compromise, confirm Lord Grey's reciprocating scale of "social equality" between the Church and the "Anti-Church" in Australia. Happily, as will be seen by our Colonial Intelligence, Lord Grey's rescript *came too late for the birth-day*—and not only from the clergy, but from the laity of the Church, a protest in word and deed worthy of the occasion has been thereby elicited. It is scarcely possible that Lord Grey's assumption of the royal prerogative—a point so wisely and temperately raised by the Bishop of Sydney, and so palpably eluded in the Secretary of State's reply, can meet with the approbation of any section in parliament beyond the less reflecting of the Roman Catholic members; whilst the material product of such unprincipled favours—increased arrogance and assumption on the part of those who receive them—so abundantly manifested in either series of the papers we are now noticing, must go far, we think, to convince our liberal government itself of the absurdity, if not the danger, of the course they are rashly and ignorantly pursuing towards the most subtle and far-reaching hierarchy the world has ever seen.

VI.—*The Greek Testament: with a critically revised Text: a Digest of various Readings: Marginal References to Verbal and Idiomatic Usage: Prolegomena: and a Critical and Exegetical Commentary. For the use of Theological Students and Ministers. By* Henry Alford, *M.A., Vicar of Wymeswold, Leicestershire, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.* In 2 vols. London: Rivingtons.

It is with some anxiety that we are now compelled to look on works relating to the criticism of the Holy Scripture. Our critics in the present day are so frequently students of a theology which is tainted with rationalism throughout, and which rarely fails to communicate some of its influences to students, that the believer is obliged to look with some degree of jealousy on all new claimants to the title of Biblical critics. We cannot pretend to have

perused the whole of Mr. Alford's first volume now before us, and comprising his Prolegomena, and his text of the Four Evangelists, with annotations; but we have seen enough to be satisfied of his qualifications for the task he has undertaken,—if learning, research, and piety, are to be considered as qualifications.

The Prolegomena comprise remarks on the general characteristics of the four Gospels, their independence, the origin of the three first Gospels, their discrepancies, fragmentary nature, inspiration, and the impracticability of constructing a formal harmony out of them. Then follow special remarks on each Gospel in particular; and this is succeeded by the more strictly critical part, including an account of the means taken to secure a correct text, by the aid of manuscripts, and versions, and ancient writers. It appears, that in the formation of his text, Mr. Alford has followed a recent German critic, Lachmann, combining with him another German, Scholz. Lachmann professes to derive his text entirely from the oldest manuscripts in uncial characters, and he is depended on for readings derived from them. Scholz is the authority for the later MSS, versions, &c.

The annotations, which are clearly printed in small type at the foot of the page, are replete with well-digested learning, and present the fruits of much patient thought. They evince a familiarity with all the modern German commentators, as well as with the writings of older critics, and other writers.

It can hardly be expected that on a subject on which so much variety of criticism exists, Mr. Alford's views will meet with concurrence in all points. We must notice some parts of his Prolegomena, in which a difference of opinion will doubtless be found to exist between him and other learned men of the present day.

Mr. Alford maintains the distinctness of the Gospels from each other, that is, that no one of them was borrowed from the other. He observes, that in the absence of any direct historical testimony, we can only determine this question by a careful examination of the contents of the Gospels. After a survey of the various theories which suppose one or other of the Gospels as written before the other Gospels, and exercising some kind of influence on their composition, he proceeds to state his own view, which is, that the three Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, arose "independently of one another."

The origin of the matter common to all these Gospels, is thus traced:—

"I believe then that the Apostles, in virtue not merely of their having been eye and ear witnesses of the Evangelic history, but especially of *their office*, gave to the various Churches their testimony in *a narrative of facts:* such narrative being modified in each case by the

individual mind of the Apostle himself, and his sense of what was requisite for the particular community to which he was ministering. While they were principally together, and instructing the converts at Jerusalem, such narrative would naturally be *for the most part the same*, and expressed in the same, or nearly the same words: coincident however *not from design or rule*, but because *the things themselves were the same*, and the teaching naturally fell for the most part into one form. It would be easy and interesting to follow the probable origin and growth of such a cycle of narratives of the words and deeds of our Lord in the Church at Jerusalem,—for both the Jews and the Hellenists, the latter under such teachers as Philip and Stephen, commissioned and authenticated by the Apostles. In the course of such a process, some portions would naturally be written down by private believers, for their own use or that of friends. And as the Church spread to Samaria, Cæsarea, and Antioch, the want would be felt in each of these places of similar cycles of oral teaching, which when supplied would thenceforward belong to and be current in those respective Churches. And these portions of the Evangelic history, oral or partially documentary, would be adopted under the sanction of the Apostles, who were, as in all things, so especially in this, the appointed and divinely-guided overseers of the whole Church. This *common substratum of Apostolic teaching*,—never formally adopted by all, but subject to all the varieties of diction and arrangement, addition and omission, incident to transmission through many individual minds, and into many different localities,—*I believe to have been the original source of the common part of our three Gospels.*" —pp. 7, 8.

It will be seen from the above that Mr. Alford rejects the theory on which harmonists of the Gospels have usually proceeded, in assuming the supplementary character of three out of the four. In fact he proceeds subsequently to argue against all attempts to construct a regular harmony. Here Mr. Alford will be met by many and able opponents, whom we must leave him to contend against as best he may. Undoubtedly there is a great amount of authority in favour of the possibility of constructing a regular harmony. From the second century such attempts have been made. The multiplicity of these attempts would, however, seem to bear out Mr. Alford's theory. No harmony has ever commanded general assent. Yet, on the other hand, it would be too much to say, we think, that it cannot be done, or that the right mode has not yet been discovered. The supplemental character of either of the Gospels however, or their precise date, are matters of conjecture more or less probable. It may be that Mr. Alford is right in supposing the Gospels to be perfectly distinct in their origin, and not borrowed from each other, or written in reference to each other. We see nothing to prevent a Churchman from receiving such a notion, and it appears to present a fair amount of

probability, and to have certain advantages over any other theory or view. There seems no improbability that the Gospels may have been local in their origin, as much as the Epistles; and that they represent the apostolic teaching in four localities, written down independently. We may attribute the different early creeds, and the varieties in the ancient liturgies, perhaps, to the same cause—distinct apostolic teaching, maintaining the same substratum of doctrine. We do not presume, however, to offer any decided opinion on these points, which must after all be more or less matter of conjecture.

We must now proceed to some other points in which we feel less satisfied with the conclusions to which Mr. Alford has arrived, or the theories which he puts forward. He asserts the Hebrew original of St. Matthew's Gospel, and in this is supported by high authorities; but we confess we do not like his opinion that the present Gospel we possess is a mere compilation from the original, and one *not even made under the Apostle's superintendence.* We think that statements of this kind are unfortunate, and that they should not be made without some stronger reasons than Mr. Alford has advanced for his conjecture. Mr. Alford rests the whole inspiration of the Gospels on the testimony of the primitive Church to them as authentic monuments of the teaching of the Apostles. By this testimony we may safely hold, and if those who recognize the testimony of the early Church to the genuineness of the Gospel History are content to abide by their principles in reference to the inspiration of the Scriptures as the Word of God, we shall have all that can be desired. The primitive Church clearly looked upon the Scriptures of the New Testament as possessing the same Divine authority as the Jews ascribed to the Old Testament only. We must now take our leave for the present of Mr. Alford, expressing our sense of his research and labour, and of the value of much that he has brought together in his volume, while we see here and there certain points on which we are compelled to withhold our assent,—though in no unfriendly spirit.

VII.—*The Sinfulness of Little Sins. A Course of Sermons preached in Lent. By* JOHN JACKSON, *M.A., Rector of St. James's, Westminster, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.* London: Skeffington.

THE author of this little volume of discourses could not have selected a more useful subject than that which he has here so ably treated. He has not shrunk from the greatest and most necessary duty of the Christian preacher,—that of warning his

hearers against "the sin that doth so easily beset them." The great mass of the attendants on Divine service are not gross sinners. Their sins are just "the little sins" which form the subject of these discourses—sins not indeed little in themselves, but little in comparison with other offences, and little in the opinion of men. Sins of temper—sins of pride and vanity—sins of the thoughts—sins of the tongue—and sins of omission—all of which are here treated of—are just those sins which are apt to be too much overlooked, both by preachers and hearers; and Mr. Jackson has done good service in bringing these prominently forward, and dwelling upon them.

The characteristics of Mr. Jackson's discourses are plain, vigorous common sense, grave, and distinct enunciation of Christian duties, enforced on Christian principles. The following passage will convey a notion of the style:—

"To falsehood, too, belongs the sin of flattery; by which I do not mean here the praising others falsely with a view to profit by them, which is the worst kind of dishonesty; but that flattery which takes the name of courtesy, and which men are apt to imagine is demanded of them by good breeding, and even by Christian charity. Now, we certainly are not obliged to upbraid our neighbours with their faults, nor even to notice them, excepting when to do so may lead to their amendment, or tend to God's honour. But then nothing whatever can make it right in us by undeserved praise or undue complaisance to strengthen another in too good an opinion of his own merits, nor to darken the mist of vanity which conceals his real character from himself."—p. 121.

The volume is written throughout in this plain, searching, practical way; and we may congratulate its author for having thus added to the stock of sound pulpit divinity, which forms so important a branch of our theological literature.

VIII.—*The Seven Ages of the Church; or, the Seven Apocalyptic Epistles interpreted by Church History. By the Rev.* HENRY COTTERILL, *M.A., Vice-Principal and Theological Tutor of Brighton College, &c.* London: Bell.

THE author of the volume before us conceives the addresses to the Churches, at the commencement of the Book of Revelation, to have a prophetical character—a position by no means peculiar to Mr. Cotterill—and he employs ecclesiastical history with much care and ingenuity in the elucidation of these supposed prophecies. Mr. Cotterill's view is, as he informs us, the Protestant view; and his great authority is Mr. Elliott. He accordingly introduces much of the usual criticism of superstitious and ido-

latrous practices, and winds up, by comparing the spirit of the present age to that of the church of Laodicea. His volume is, on the whole, clearly and thoughtfully written.

IX.—*Letters to a Lady. By the Baron* WILHELM VON HUMBOLDT. *From the German.* London: Hall, Virtue, and Co.

THE letters of Baron Humboldt have long called for a translation into English; our countrywomen had a right to be acquainted with what they could so fully appreciate. Singular though they are in their origin and execution, they are still more valuable in the lessons they convey,—inculcating an integrity of mind and strength of purpose, combined with the tenderness of an amiable heart, and presenting a pleasing idea of both the teacher and his friend.

The circumstances of the correspondence throw much peculiarity into their composition: an acquaintance made in youth—continuing but a few days—then broken—but not forgotten—is suddenly renewed, after the lapse of six-and-twenty years had brought many and painful changes to each. When assistance, sympathy, and consolation became necessary to her with whom time had dealt most hardly, she sought the friend whose image she had preserved in faithful simplicity—and was not disappointed. It would be impossible to suppose Humboldt capable of repulsing any one in distress of mind; but he found a real charm in the talents and thoughtfulness of his correspondent's letters, and set himself, *con amore*, to the task of guiding, supporting, and occupying her mind, with the noble and delicate kindness of the purest friendship, and the skilfulness of one intimately acquainted with the strength and the weakness of a woman's heart.

One cannot help regretting the absence of her share of the correspondence: it would surely afford us a picture of the life of a gentle but high-minded woman, struggling through many trials and difficulties: but she gave her friend's letters to the public, only in the hope of their benefiting others, and from no self-gratulatory pride. Nor ought they to be read without leaving traces of permanent good on all who thus put themselves under the guidance of Baron Humboldt; his letters breathe such a spirit of calm contentment, cheerfulness, and charity to all around him—a spirit of endurance without hardness—an example of victorious self-control under all circumstances—and withal earnestness in his convictions of the truth of all he teaches and acts upon.

There is, besides this, an enjoyment of nature, which can only

proceed from a serene and pure soul, and which Humboldt cultivated as one of the chief sources of inward strength—a perfect connexion of the external world with the workings of the inner life of man, which cannot fail to increase the calm vigour of a thankful and contented spirit. Humboldt was a believer in Christianity, and no *rationalistic* views offend us in this volume.

We cannot attempt in our limited space to give extracts, or we might quote many beautiful passages in which the vigorous but well-governed soul is seen borrowing from nature the harmony with which she was created, and learning the peaceful satisfaction of the courage and firmness which accepts the struggles of life, as a burthen to be lovingly and cheerfully borne.

We must say a few words on the translation before us, regretting that we have not the German original at hand. The inelegant English into which it has been rendered is of less importance than the omissions and compressions we observe in many places, and which ought, at least, to be acknowledged to the reader, who has also a right to ask why such a small portion of these letters are thus published, without any apparent reason for their fragmentary appearance, or promise of a future portion. We believe a *complete* translation by a lady has been published, together with the *whole* of the preface prefixed to the original—not the least interesting part of the work.

x.—*The Earth's Antiquity, in Harmony with the Mosaic Record of the Creation. By* James Gray, *M.A., Rector of Dibden, Hants.* London: Parker.

This is a very pleasingly written little work, occasioned, as the author tells us, by some statements made at a meeting of the British Association, respecting the earth's vast antiquity. Such statements having created uneasy feelings in the author's mind, he set to work to investigate the subject, and the result is the present volume, in which the Mosaic Record is brought into harmony with the largest possible speculations of geologists. We have not seen much in the mode of effecting this object, whether desirable or no, which strikes us as very new; but every one must do justice to the good intentions of the author, and to the respectability of his attainments.

xi.—*The First Revelations of God to Man, considered in a Series of Sermons on the First Chapters of Genesis. By the Rev.* W. E. Evans, *Prebendary and Prelector of Hereford Cathedral.* London: Rivingtons.

Here we have another geologico-theological work—the author

addressing himself in his preface and his sermons to meet the difficulties presented by the researches and views of geologists on the earth's antiquity. The author is of opinion that we should do very wrongly in attempting to deny evident facts,—in which we agree with him; and he is of opinion that truth will not be endangered by inquiry, fairly and honestly conducted,—in which we also have the pleasure to agree with him. We think that no apologies are needed for those who endeavour to harmonize the theories of philosophers with the word of God; but, at the same time, we think it indicates rather a weak faith to be disturbed by such speculations, or to attach much weight to them. —Christianity is far more certain than all the speculations of philosophy.

XII.—*An Examination of Calvinism; and especially of its Present Modified Forms, by the Text of Holy Scripture, and the Unanimous Teaching of the Church, together with a View of the Rise of the Predestinarian Doctrines. By the Rev.* W. HOUGHTON, *Curate of the Parishes of Sennen and St. Levan, in the Deanery of St. Buryan, Cornwall. Second Edition, revised and greatly enlarged.* London: Cleaver.

THIS manual of the Calvinistic Controversy possesses the advantage of being a systematic treatise on the subject to which it refers, composed without reference to any special controversy; and the author is thus enabled to apply himself to the elucidation of his difficult theme with the temper, consideration, and care which its importance demands. The result is one of the most useful works we have seen, comprising a great mass of argument in a very condensed shape, furnished with abundant references to the principal works on both sides of the question, and exhibiting a clearness of view, and an amount of research, which are most creditable to the author. We commend it to the especial attention of the younger Clergy, and candidates for orders.

XIII.—*The closing Years of Dean Swift's Life; with Remarks on Stella, and on some of his writings, hitherto unnoticed. By* W. R. WILDE, *M.R.I.A., F.R.C.S., &c. Second Edition.* Dublin: Hodges and Smith.

THIS is not a very promising title, we must confess, and yet the book itself is decidedly a curious and even amusing one. The author, who is a surgeon, enters into the medical peculiarities of Dean Swift's case, and argues, with apparent probability, that Swift did not become insane, but experienced a kind of congestion of the brain, which gradually deprived him of his faculties, in the

same way as Sir Walter Scott. The volume contains engravings of the skull and bust of Swift, and also of the skull of Stella, about whom there is much curious information, as well as about many of the minor anonymous poems and other writings of Swift, which exhibit the characteristic grossness, humour, good sense, bitterness, and indelicacy of that writer. Many of these are curious as memorials of Ireland and Irish society in the days of Swift. The interest of the volume is, to a considerable extent, local; but the author is a keen observer, and a diligent collector of anecdotes and facts.

XIV.—*The Modern Housewife or Ménagère; comprising nearly One Thousand Receipts for the economic and judicious Preparation of every Meal of the day, &c. &c. By* ALEXIS SOYER, *Author of the 'Gastronomic Regenerator' (Reform Club).* London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.

THE name of the illustrious *chef* who figures as the author of this work, will elicit for his volume the appetite which, we have no doubt, it richly deserves, and of which the *piquant* nature of its contents must be irresistibly provocative. The author is a caterer for the mind as well as the body, and we contemplate with gusto the picture of this eminent individual which meets us in the title-page, and which in our stupidity we at first took for that of one of the very respectable animals who supply the materials of the author's literary and culinary discussion. We must confess, with a sense of humiliation, that we are unable to do justice to this noble subject. We throw down the pen with a sigh. Our gastronomic vigour is unable to bear us up amidst the tide of condiments, force-meat, jellies, fish, soups, savouries, pastry, &c. &c. &c., which meets us at each step. We are overwhelmed by the grandeur of the whole conception, and by the exhaustless resources of the magician who is each moment engaged before us in transmuting the ordinary materials of animal and vegetable existence into delicacies qualified to meet the highest demands of critical tastes,—while at the same time his universal benevolence prompts him to place within the reach of every housewife the means of approximating, in her degree, to the enjoyments reserved for the favoured visitants of the "Reform Club."

XV.—*Developments of Protestantism, and other Fragments; reprinted from the "Dublin Review," and "Tablet."* London: Richardson.

THIS is a controversial tract against the Church of England,

extracted from a work of Mr. T. W. Marshall, late a clergyman of the Church of England, and who on his apostasy from the Church, was rewarded by the Government by being appointed one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools. This tract comprises the substance of Mr. Marshall's work, (we forget the title,) in which the state of Protestantism is described in the most unfavourable terms, and in which it was easy to see principles and feelings, leading by a natural development to the secession which subsequently took place. In this tract, which is put forward with the initials of Mr. Marshall, *one of the Government Inspectors of Schools*, the Reformation and the Church of England are assailed in every way, and the utmost possible pains are taken to induce men to leave our communion. We think this is a subject that ought to be inquired into, and that the position of inspectors of schools should be more distinctly understood.

XVI.—*Leicestershire Words, Phrases, and Proverbs. Collected by* ARTHUR B. EVANS, *D.D., &c.* London: Pickering.

WORKS of this kind are not without their value, independently of any local interest, in preserving fragments of the older language and customs of the country, and are thus of use to the philologist and antiquarian. Dr. Evans appears, as far as we can judge, to have executed his task carefully and well.

XVII.—*Lessons for Writing from Dictation, adapted to the Use of Children in Village Schools. By* WILLIAM EWART, *M.A., Curate of Pimperne, Dorset.* London: Robinson.

THIS is without exception the best book for dictation in schools that we have ever seen. It is progressive, and it is throughout amusing and instructive.

XVIII.—*Judith: or, the Prophetess of Bethulia. A Romance from the Apocrypha.* London: Hatchards.

THIS work is adapted to the use of that not inconsiderable class of persons who are unwilling to place in the hands of young persons a novel or a romance, and who yet may feel it desirable to indulge them with some reading of a nature calculated to interest their imagination and their feelings. The tale before us meets these conditions. Founded on Jewish history, it has the seriousness which they would wish to preserve, while it is not without its descriptions and its scenery, and its array and concatenation of incidents, and its catastrophe. There is enough of love, too, in the tale to meet the requisitions of some minds; but it is just

what it ought to be—very much under the influence of conscientious feeling. In short, there is nothing that can be considered too light or gay in the whole affair, and we should, therefore, think it likely to obtain an extensive circulation amongst seriously-minded persons.

XIX.—*Chronicles and Characters of the Stock Exchange. By* JOHN FRANCIS. London: Willoughby and Co.

THIS is really a curious volume in its revelations of the inner-workings of the moneyed world. It is for the most part, as might be anticipated, a record of speculations, frauds, and cheating, of every description. It records the failure of some schemes, and the success of others; the sudden creation of some large fortunes, and the as sudden loss of others. The Stock Exchange, it appears, is reserved exclusively for the use of its members, who are extremely jealous of any intrusion in their haunts, and are not particularly polite in their mode of dealing with any unlucky person who may visit them. The following anecdote is curious enough, as illustrating the manners which prevail amongst these people:—

"Not long ago, a friend of my own, ignorant of the rule so rigidly enforced for the expulsion of strangers, chanced to drop in, as he phrased it, at the Stock Exchange. He walked about for nearly a minute without being discovered to be an intruder, indulging in surprise at finding that the greatest uproar and frolic prevailed in a place in which he expected there would be nothing but order and decorum. All at once, a person who had just concluded a hasty but severe scrutiny of his features, sent out at the full stretch of his voice—'Fourteen hundred.' Then a bevy of gentlemen of the house surrounded him—'Will you purchase my new navy five per cent., sir?' said one, eagerly, looking him in the face. 'I am not'—the stranger was about to say, he was not going to purchase stock of any kind, but was prevented finishing his sentence by his hat being, through a powerful application of some one's hand to its crown, not only forced over his eyes, but over his mouth also. Before he had time to recover from the stupefaction into which the suddeness and violence of the eclipse threw him, he was seized by the shoulders and wheeled about as if he had been a revolving machine. He was then pushed about from one person to another, as if he had been only the effigy of some human being, instead of a human being himself. After tossing and hustling him about in the roughest possible manner, denuding his coat of one of its tails, and tearing into fragments other parts of his wardrobe, they carried him to the door, where, after depositing him on his feet, they left him to recover his lost senses at his leisure."—pp. 332, 333.

Some of our readers will probably be glad to know the meaning

of terms which are familiar to us in the public journals—we mean "Bulls" and "Bears."

"'Bull' is a term applied to those who contract to buy any quantity of government securities without the intention or ability to pay for it; and who are, therefore, obliged to sell it again, either at a profit or loss, before the time at which they have contracted to take it.

"'Bear' is a term applied to a person who has agreed to sell any quantity of the public funds, of which he is not possessed, being, however, obliged to deliver it against a certain time."—p. 339.

Our opinion of the Stock Exchange and its doings, is, we confess, not improved by the perusal of this volume.

XX.—*The Life and Literary Remains of Barbara Hofland, Author of "The Son of a Genius," "Tales of the Manor," &c. By* THOMAS RAMSAY, *Author of "A Glance of Belgium and the Rhine."* London: Cleaver.

A WRITER like Mrs. Hofland certainly deserves some memorial, and the author of the Life before us has executed a work which is calculated to preserve some recollection of Mrs. Hofland's labours in the field of literature. The number of her works was very large; in fact, her pen furnished the chief means of her support; and she appears to have passed through a course of adverse fortune with a cheerful and a Christian spirit. The work before us will be interesting to the literary circles in which Mrs. Hofland moved; we cannot suppose it will have much interest for the general reader.

XXI.—*On Catechising. By the Hon. and Rev.* SAMUEL BEST, *Rector of Abbot's Ann, &c.* London: Darling.

IN the very useful publication before us, Mr. Best urges the necessity of Catechising, from the examples of ancient times, and the directions of the Church; and further lends his aid to the carrying out of this important branch of ministerial duty, by supplying a series of questions on the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels for each Sunday in the year.

XXII.—*Scripture Symbolism; or, Tabernacle Architecture. By the Rev.* SAMUEL GARRATT, *&c.* London: Seeleys.

A SERIES of essays, in which the various parts of the tabernacle are treated as symbolizing various portions of the Christian scheme. The author is chiefly engaged in protesting against the doctrines of Tractarianism and of Popery. His language and tone appear to us to be pretty much those of a Dissenter.

XXIII.—*The Practical Christian, or the Devout Penitent. By* R. SHERLOCK, *D.D., sometime Rector of Winwick. With a Life of the Author. By* THOMAS WILSON, *D.D., sometime Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man. Edited by the Rev.* HAROLD SHERLOCK, *M.A., &c.* Oxford: Parker.

THE author of the admirable book, of which we have copied the title, was maternal uncle of the good Bishop Wilson, and his life, written by that venerable man, is prefixed. There cannot be a better manual of devotion than this, which is also in good measure taken from ancient sources, and breathes the spirit of ancient devotion. It is just such a book as may be well supposed to have formed the opinions and influenced the feelings of the excellent Bishop Wilson.

XXIV.—*Reflections, Meditations, and Prayers, (with Gospel Harmony,) on the most Holy Life and Sacred Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ.* London: Masters.

WE have been edified by all we have read of this collection of devotional exercises. The meditations, as the author states, are taken partly from Bishop Hall's contemplations, partly from the homilies of Thomas à Kempis, and partly from well-known Latin and French writers. It is dedicated to Archdeacon Manning and the Rev. Isaac Williams.

XXV.—*Plain Truths on Important Subjects. By the Rev.* W. THORPE, *D.D., Minister of Belgrave Chapel.* London: Seeleys.

THIS little volume, which comprises elementary instruction on the principal branches of Christian belief, according to the author's views, has very favourably impressed us, as far as we have been able to peruse it. The tone is particularly pleasing; and the delineation of the broad principles of the Gospel, though strongly marked with the doctrines of imputed righteousness, and of those views of justification which will not even tolerate St. James's language, or permit that it can be used in an innocent sense, is simple and in many respects excellent. We have been gratified with many parts of this work, even while we are unable to concur in all its views.

XXVI.—*Fourth Series of Lectures on Subjects connected with Prophecy. Preached by the Rev.* JAMES KELLY, *M.A., Incumbent of Stillorgan, Dublin, &c.* Published by Request. Second Edition. London: Nisbet and Co.

THE subjects of this series of lectures are—"the ultimate object

of the redemption by Christ—the object and character of the present dispensation between the Ascension and the second Advent—the general subject of the second Advent." Into the depths of the subjects here entered on by the writer, we cannot pretend to follow him. We have no doubt that his style is greatly admired by many of his hearers: it is at one moment colloquial, at another vehement, and at a third your feet are carried from under you by a torrent of imagery and Scripture quotation. We have no doubt that this style of sermon, set off with appropriate action, is vastly impressive to those who have the privilege to "sit under" the ministry of such a "Boanerges" as this. We cite the following specimen of his oratorical powers:—

"It is no barren speculation, my brethren, but glorious 'truth' which tends to deepen the soul's communion with God, yea, to enwrap it into very ecstasy. And, allow me to add, to see the ultimate end of God, 'his eternal purpose in Christ Jesus,' to which all things are verging, and *our* interest in it; for 'all things,' says the Apostle, 'are for your sakes;' and yet to be diverted and engrossed with the vanishing scene which is around us! oh, how utterly incongruous! It is like the silly child using the alphabet given to it, whereby he learns to read, and ascend into communion with its parent's mind, as a mere toy to play with . . . . But, beloved, let us remember, that if we are Christ's we are *of God*. We are in the diving-bell, as it were, of the Church, through which, although surrounded by the heavy elements of earth, we inhale another atmosphere, even that of the kingdom of God's dear Son.

'There is our house and portion fair,
Our treasure and our hearts are there,
And our abiding home:
For us our elder brethren stay,
And angels beckon us away,
And Jesus bids us come.'

"This, in short, is not our rest. And *present* things—all that constitutes the 'world' in its commercial, political, and literary greatness,—should be to us, but the temporary scaffolding which is to be taken down, and we know not how soon. As to those who, amidst the loud sounding testimony of the Gospel of Christ, still cleave to the earth, and walk after 'the course of this world,' let them know that . . . . none will fall so deep into the pit of perdition as they who stumble over a rejected Christ. In contrast with the saved—the echoes of God's own harmony of character, they will be eternally at jar with God. They will constitute the bass, the discord, to set off the melody. In them the exuviæ—the slough, the dross of creation—will be preserved a memorial of what the *staple* of all saved creaturehood is," &c. &c.

This is most sublime!

XXVII.—*A Letter on the Antichristian Character of Free-Masonry, to the Rev. W. Carwithen, D.D., &c. By* M. C. TREVILIAN, *Esq., a voluntary Seceder from the Society.* Bath: Binns and Goodwin. London: Whittaker and Co.

THE work before us contains a strong denunciation of free-masonry as an Unchristian system, substituting itself for the Gospel, and essentially latitudinarian and infidel, though it may sometimes connect itself for convenience with religion.

The author seems a religious and earnest man; but we cannot quite share his feelings in relation to free-masonry, which appears from his paper to be a piece of folly and absurdity from beginning to end.

XXVIII.—*Seven Sermons preached on Various Occasions before the University of Oxford. By the Rev.* H. B. WILLIAMS, *M.A., New College, Fellow of Winchester College, &c.* Oxford: Vincent. London: Rivingtons.

A SOUND and excellent volume of discourses, perfectly orthodox in its doctrine, and written in a manly and vigorous tone, without the puritanism of one school, or the speculativeness of another.

XXIX.—*Report to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland by their Committee for the Suppression of Intemperance, given in and read by Rev. Robert H. Muir, Convener,* 31*st May,* 1849. *With Notes of Returns made to a Circular issued by that Committee by Four Hundred and Seventy-eight Kirk-Sessions.* Edinburgh: Picton and Ritchie.

IN perusing this interesting volume, we have been reminded of the contrast which exists between the position of the Presbyterian Establishment in Scotland, and the Church of England, as regards their present position. We here see the Presbyterian Kirk exercising its full legal power of meeting, and proposing, and discussing measures in relation to its own spiritual welfare; while the Church of England remains without the exercise of those rights which the law and constitution of England give to her. The General Assembly is in active operation, while the Convocation is virtually suppressed by the indirect, unconstitutional interference of the Executive; for we must ascribe to this the reluctance of our Archbishops to permit the Convocation to act at all.

Let us turn to the Report before us. Although we cannot regard the Presbyterian as the true Church in Scotland, yet we rejoice in the evidence which this Report affords us of the laudable

anxiety and zeal of its members to remove one of the greatest moral evils from which a nation can suffer,—that of excess in the use of spirituous liquors. Cordially do we sympathize with these valuable men in their truly Christian anxieties on this subject, and cordially do we hope that they may be successful in the noble undertaking which they have put before them. The resolution of the synod contains the following passages:—

"The General Assembly approve of the Report, and of the diligence of the Committee in the inquiry in which they have been engaged, for obtaining information on the important subject of their appointment, and request the Moderator to convey to Mr. Muir, and, through him, to the Committee, their thanks for the great and laudable attention which they have paid to the subject of their Report. The General Assembly view with the utmost alarm the prevalence of intemperance in many parts of the country, earnestly recommend to the Presbyteries and Kirk-sessions of the Church, to take active steps to discourage that vice within their bounds, and to adopt whatever plans a wise Christian expediency may approve as best suited to their neighbourhood, for diminishing the occasions, and checking the practice of intemperance. The General Assembly further resolve to use every possible means, in co-operation with members of the Church, for diminishing the number of licensed places for the use of ardent spirits; if necessary, to send Petitions to Parliament to get power for Licensing Courts to regulate the number and position of such places better than at present; and to do what can be done to secure the closing of them throughout the whole of the Lord's-day."

And now, having given the above quotation, we must revert to the subject of our former remarks, and inquire, How is it that we do not see our own Convocation similarly engaged? Are not we ourselves suffering from the prevalence of habits of intemperance, of fornication, and other moral evils? What multitudes of beer-shops corrupt the morals of our people! How many evils of this kind demand reformation and correction! And, assuming that we have such practical moral evils to grapple with, why do not our ecclesiastical rulers make, at least, the *attempt* to bring the power of the representative Church of England to bear on this question, by summoning Convocation together for the dispatch of business, and proceeding to appoint committees, receive reports, and make recommendations which would not have the legal force of canons, and yet would answer perhaps just as well. The Church of England, if it ever dies, will, we believe, die of caution, timidity, and sitting still. We are glad to see Presbyterians applying themselves vigorously and unitedly to the suppression of social evils. We should be glad to see the Church of England joining them in this effort;—but that may not be.

The General Synod of the Presbyterian Kirk appointed some time since a Committee to examine into the question of drunkenness—certainly a most right and fitting subject of inquiry; and this committee addressed circulars of inquiries to all the Kirk-sessions in Scotland, which have been replied to in nearly 500 cases, and furnish an important body of moral statistics. We are deeply grieved to find from these returns, and from statements in the public journals, that the consumption of ardent spirits in Scotland has become so very large in proportion to the population. This is not the kind of alteration that is wanted in Scotland, whose inhabitants have been so long celebrated for thrift, intelligence, and good conduct. The following passage from the Report of the Committee is very painful:—

"It is, no doubt, very gratifying to your Committee to be able to report, from the information they have received, that there are parishes in Scotland where the vice of intemperance may be said to be unknown, —that, in very many there has, of late years, been a decided change for the better—and that, perhaps, even where the evil may have, on the whole, increased, there are *certain classes* of the population—among whom the vice was at one time very common—where it is now altogether relinquished. Yet, still, your Committee grieve to say, that the parishes are very few indeed where the direful consequences of intemperance, in some shape or other, are not painfully apparent. They have had to deeply sympathise with many of their brethren, whose faithful ministry is pursued amidst the most trying difficulties—where Sabbath profanation and neglect of ordinances, blasphemy, and crime, poverty, wretchedness, and disease, as the immediate consequences of intemperance, combine to prove that vice to be one of the very greatest external obstacles to the success of the Gospel. While, even where the prevalence of the vice is not apparent in its most revolting shape of *habitual* intoxication, your Committee have had to sympathise with others of their brethren, who find the practice among their people, of *occasional* intemperance, at least as great, if not a greater evil; an evil which (to quote the words of one of their returns) 'eats into the heart of the congregation, and sears the soul against the truth.' Even in places, therefore, where the vice of intemperance assumes a less revolting shape than in others, there may be equal cause for alarm, and just as urgent need for the anxious care of the Church in the use of means for its suppression.

"Your Committee feel, that the bad pre-eminence which intemperance holds among the national sins, is due, in great part, to the influence of *national customs;* and that there is cause for anxiety and alarm, and urgent need for measures to suppress intemperance—not only in the evil *nature* of the vice—in its wide *extent* and woeful *fruits*—but mainly in the appalling force of the many outward circumstances which lead to the formation and indulgence of intemperate habits. For a detail of such circumstances, your Committee must refer to the Notes in the

Appendix to this Report. They can here but glance at a general view of some of the most prominent.

"Among these circumstances, the Committee are especially grieved to find the practice of *drinking at private baptisms and funerals*. It is reported to them (and justly complained of as a circumstance, the force of which is very great for encouraging intemperance), that, in some parts of the country, still, occasions for indulging to excess are found in the supply of intoxicating liquors at these solemn meetings. The instances of excess on such occasions, your Committee believe, are rare. It is matter of congratulation, that, in the mode of conducting baptisms and funerals, throughout the greater number of the parishes reported on to your Committee, there is marked improvement; and that, in many instances, the practice of using intoxicating liquors at all, on such occasions, is nearly, if not altogether, abandoned. Yet, rare though it be, your Committee report the circumstance complained of to them, in order to bring under the condemnatory notice of the Assembly all drinking usages in connexion with the administration of holy ordinances, —usages which, while they can but *desecrate* a solemn religious service, do tend to gain, for sinful habits of excess, the *consecration* of being associated with what is serious and holy.

"But, passing out from meetings for religious worship, which national customs have made the occasions for the abuse of intoxicating liquors, your Committee find that, in the returns made to their inquiries, almost every other kind of meeting is complained of as connected with customs which have proved the snare to intemperance. Meetings at marriages (especially, as was to be expected, when these are celebrated in public-houses), meetings at markets and fairs—meetings to settle any matter of business, or at the close of any piece of work—are all reported to your Committee as so inwrought with drinking customs, as to sadly tend to the formation and practice of intemperate habits. Then, from many quarters, the strongest language is employed in reporting the demoralizing influence of the customs at feeing-markets, where farm-servants are gathered to be hired. While in towns, especially, the worst effects are produced by drinking usages in many of the trades, by which the workmen are systematically trained to habits of intoxication.

"But, in addition to all these outward circumstances tending to promote such habits, your Committee have had their attention loudly called to the monstrous evil of multiplying licensed places for the sale of intoxicating liquors, and, especially, the licensing of shops and toll-bars. The returns made to your Committee's inquiries clearly prove, that the intemperance of any neighbourhood is uniformly proportioned to the number of its spirit licenses. So that, wherever there are no public-houses, nor any shops for selling spirits, there ceases to be any intoxication. The recklessly multiplying of what are thus evidently so many centres of a vicious influence, cannot but be regarded as a public calamity. It forces temptations upon the people at every step, and actually brings to bear upon them all the active efforts of an excessive competition in a lucrative trade, for stimulating their practice of a ruinous vice.

xxx.—*Moral Tales. By the Author of "Hymns for Little Children."* London: Masters.

This little book precisely meets the wish which we formed on perusing the "Hymns for Little Children." It is impossible to speak too highly of its execution. It is exactly what it ought to be. And heartily do we wish that both volumes, comprising so much of Church principle, conveyed with so much affectionate simplicity, were read in every school and nursery throughout the kingdom. We give the following specimen :—

THE SWALLOW.

Where are you going, faithless swallow,
Fast drifting down the autumn sky?
Along the path I cannot follow
Not even with my dizzy eye.
Why should you fly away so fast,
Because the summer day is past?

How oft when rosy morning gilded
Our roof, I heard you through the leaves,
Soft twittering round the nest you builded
Close underneath our cottage eaves!
Watch'd your quick wings to and fro
Before my window come and go.

While yet the early dew was drying
Upon the roses on the wall;
And in their clay-built shelter lying,
I heard your hungry children's call,
That pretty nest I never stirr'd;
Why should you go, ungrateful bird?

You stay'd there all the summer season,
Till we like two old friends had grown,
And now you're going, for no reason,
But that its pleasant days are flown.
Ah swallow! it would never do,
If all my friends should prove like you.

For friends should be as true in sorrow
As when our hearts are light and gay,
They should not run away to-morrow,
Because 'tis sadder than to-day,
But stay and cheer, and soothe us still,
In times of darkness, want, or ill.

But you would stay beside me only
When summer skies are bright and clear,
And leave me now all sad, and lonely,
To wear away the closing year.
I see your little cloven tail,
A speck before the northern gale.

Go summer and false friend, together,
And welcome, pure unselfish hearts,
The love that's true in any weather,
The friend that no misfortune parts.
I have no heart for him to share,
Who only loves when skies are fair.

XXXI.—*The Last Sleep of the Christian Child.* London: Masters.

A LITTLE poem intended to teach children what a Christian death is—and very touchingly written. It tells just enough, and not too much.

XXXII.—*Sharpe's London Magazine.* 1849. Hall: Paternoster-row.

WE take the opportunity of commencing another year, to express our approbation of the above publication. It is more interesting than most of the periodicals of the kind, combining as it does the useful with the agreeable, conveying much valuable information, pleasant fictions, and compilations from the passing literature of the day. There are occasionally excellent sketches from history, with short essays on subjects of reflection, and carefully written papers on natural history and the sciences of every-day things. Besides this, we have two, generally speaking, very good engravings: the illustrations of the old English and Scottish ballads being very successful.

On the other hand, we must regret the arrangement of some of the articles; there being usually such a crowd of subjects as to leave too little room for each individually. In the stories this is provoking, and tends much to lessen the interest and to obscure the moral; since, by only receiving a couple of pages or so at a time, the cause and effect of each person's actions are forgotten, and their characteristics destroyed: we allude in particular to the "Story of a Family"—a story in itself of somewhat an intricate nature, and which would be rendered wholly unintelligible by this dribbling mode of publication, were it not for its singular interest and power.

We trust the magazine will enjoy the large circulation which it deserves.

XXXIII.—*The History of Spain, for Young Persons. By the Rev.* B. G. JOHNS, *M.A., Master of the Dulwich Grammar School, &c.* London: Masters.

A VERY clear and succinct account of the history of Spain, from the earliest date to the present day. It appears to be well adapted to the use of children and young persons.

XXXIV.—*The Nemesis of Faith. By* J. A. FROUDE, *M.A., late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Second Edition.* London: Chapman.

THE author of this rationalistic book was one of the disciples and admirers of Newman, previously to the secession of the latter from the Church; and this volume shows plainly, what many persons foresaw, that the overstrained speculations of the leading minds would, in the end, unsettle the faith of some of their followers. The truth is, that the ultra-tractarian system was throughout sapping the foundation of objective religion, and resolving faith into that very individual exercise of private judgment, fancy, or feeling, against which it was the loudest in its protest. It ridiculed and set aside the old evidences of religion, and thus, when its moral and personal influence failed, it left its more ardent adherents without a rational foundation for faith. We have elsewhere referred more at large to Mr. Froude's opinions, and traced their analogy in principle to those of Coleridge.

XXXV.—*The Rest. An Episode of the Village of Ross Cray. By the Rev.* CLAUDE MAGNAY. London: Cleaver

A VERY pretty tale, intended to illustrate the duties of the squire of a parish in relation to the religious and moral well-being of its inhabitants, and pointing out the beneficial influence which he can bring to bear in aid of the minister of the parish, and his power of counteracting the exertions of the most faithful pastor.

XXXVI.—*The Pastor of Welbourn and his Flock.* London: J. W. Parker.

THIS little work comprises a series of instructive and useful conversations between a Clergyman and his parishioners, and seems to be intended to show the mode in which a parish priest is to address his people. We can only say, that if the priest is to discourse so fully with all his people as he here does with some, his flock ought to be a small one in point of numbers.

XXXVII.—*A History of Ecclesiastical Architecture in England. By* GEORGE AYLIFFE POOLE, *M.A., Vicar of Welford.* London: Masters.

THE work before us is one of general interest to the architect, the churchman, and the antiquarian. It traces the history of church architecture, and all its accessories, from the Christian era to the

extinction of Gothic architecture in the seventeenth century. As a record of the foundation and erection of all our cathedrals and principal churches, and the changes they have undergone, it is peculiarly interesting, and we can bear testimony to the accuracy of detail, and the extent of knowledge, with which the work has been executed. Attention is particularly directed to all the architects of our principal churches.

XXXVIII.—*The Life of Christians during the first three Centuries of the Church; a Series of Sermons on Church History. By Dr.* CHR. LUDW. CONRAD. *Translated from the German, by the Rev.* LEOPOLD J. BERNAYS. Edinburgh: Clark.

THIS series of discourses is written on the views of Neander, and represents the opinions on Church subjects which are rife among the more religious Germans. It cannot, of course, be recommended to any English Churchman. There is much to approve in the book, as far as it touches on practical subjects; but we cannot approve it on the whole.

XXXIX.—*The Devout Christian. Thoughts on his Vocation, and a Manual of Devotions for his use. By* THOMAS FREDERICK SMITH, *M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, &c.* London: Masters.

AN excellent Manual, to which we cordially wish an extensive circulation.

XL.—*A few Words of Family Instruction, Introductory to Prayers for a Christian Household. By the Rev.* T. BOWDLER, *M.A.* London: Pickering.

THIS little volume is, as its title informs us, Introductory to the excellent Manual of Prayers for a Christian Household, lately published by the respected author. In the calm and sober-minded, but elevated piety of both publications, there is a fund of edification and of instruction for the Christian reader. We hope that this truly excellent author may have the gratification of finding that his labours for the good of souls may be as extensively appreciated as they deserve to be.

XLI.—*The Danger of Superficial Knowledge. An Introductory Lecture to the Course of Natural Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh. By* JAMES D. FORBES, *Esq., F.R.S., &c.* London: J. W. Parker.

WE are much indebted to Mr. Forbes for the able refutation which he has given in this essay to the arguments of Macaulay, who, at Edinburgh, denied the truth of the well-known verse,

"a little knowledge is a dangerous thing," and maintained the benefit of superficial knowledge. Mr. Forbes has ably and powerfully shown the errors of such views; and we thank him for his seasonable essay.

XLII.—*Prophetic Outlines of the Christian Church and the Anti-Christian Power, as traced in the Visions of Daniel and St. John. In Twelve Lectures preached in the Chapel of Lincoln's Inn on the foundation of Bishop Warburton. By* BENJAMIN HARRISON, *M.A., Archdeacon of Maidstone, &c.* London: Rivingtons.

THE design of this series of Warburtonian Lectures is to direct attention to such portions of the prophecies as may be fairly regarded as fulfilled beyond any reasonable doubt. The author observes the excessive positiveness which so many interpreters of prophecy have shown in putting forth their opinions, and he alludes to the doubt which has thence been created in some minds, even on the most important points in prophecy. He addresses himself in various parts of his work to the more literal views maintained by Maitland and Todd, and argues against them. In the interpretation of the Apocalypse, he concurs with the generality of Protestant interpreters in identifying the Church of Rome with the beast. Archdeacon Harrison appears to be a careful and thoughtful writer, and to have studied his subject thoroughly. Into the particulars of his interpretations we cannot attempt to follow him.

XLIII.—*An Introduction to the New Testament; containing an Examination of the most important questions relating to the authority, interpretation, and integrity of the Canonical Books, with reference to the latest enquiries. By* SAMUEL DAVIDSON, *LL.D. Vol. I. The Four Gospels.* London: Bagster.

FROM all we have seen of the volume before us, we are of opinion that it is calculated to be of considerable utility to the student of theology. It notices all the latest objections of German infidelity against the genuineness of the Gospels, and meets all the difficulties, as far as we can judge, in a very satisfactory manner. As an assemblage of all the arguments which may be brought against the Scriptures, with their refutations, the work will be highly valuable. It exhibits very great and praiseworthy research.

XLIV.—*Short Conclusions from the Light of Nature.* London: Rivingtons.

THE "Light" of Nature, as this anonymous author describes it, is, we fear, little more than "darkness." He admits, indeed, the

existence of a Deity; but he doubts whether that Deity is or is not a material Being of the same substance as the earth; and he denies any spiritual nature in the human soul. Such, at least, is the impression left on us by the whole tenor of his work. The work is written professedly to aid the cause of religion when it is assailed by rationalism; but we must disclaim any such assistance as this. We do not believe the author to have had any directly infidel objects, or he would not have expended so large a part of his book in endeavouring to establish by reasoning the moral attributes of God; but still we do think his views on many points most dangerous. He intimates pretty plainly in one passage that he is a disbeliever in the doctrine of eternal punishment.

"The moral state of each person at the time of his death will determine his degree of happiness or misery on his arrival. But whether that state will be a final state, or it may please God to give other means of moral discipline, means of correction to the good, of real conversion to the evil, we can but conjecture. The latter supposition is an exceedingly probable, and a most delightful one, but liable to much perversion; and it becomes us to check every presumption that may arise in our frail hearts on such a glorious prospect."

This is the language of a Unitarian.

Our author maintains that all events are ordered by certain regular and inviolate laws, in accordance with the constitution of nature; and that God never interferes with the operation of these laws, or exercises a particular Providence for our benefit: so that, as he implies, prayer to God to alter the course of events, is "irrational;" and we have, in fact, merely to trust to *ourselves*, and the exertion of our own minds, for all blessings:—

"If, then, mankind in general were as sure of the invisible nature of the laws of matter as the scientific are, they would cast off the idle expectation, that these laws will be violated to bring them prosperity, or defend them from evil; and they would trust to their own minds, guided by the inspiration of God, for all temporal and spiritual blessings. Therefore, this is not merely a speculative subject, which it is almost presumptuous to investigate, but a practical inquiry, showing us '*whence our help cometh.*'"—p. 41.

We marvel at the writer's last words. How strongly does his doctrine contrast with the words of the inspired Psalmist, to which he refers!—"My help cometh even from the Lord who hath made heaven and earth. He will not suffer thy foot to be moved: and he that keepeth thee will not sleep." In order that we may be at no loss as to his meaning, he explains that "the inspiration of God," of which he speaks as guiding us, is

not meant of any special guidance or direction, but of the gift of sense and understanding which we all have from God; quoting, for this purpose, Job xxxii. 8: "But there is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding."

The question here is, indeed, a "practical" one, and of the highest importance. According to our author, it is "irrational" to pray to God for deliverance from evils, or for blessings of any kind: we ought to leave every thing to the direction of His good Providence; and we ought to depend on our own good sense and intelligence for getting through difficulties, or for obtaining benefits. This may be philosophy, but it is not religion.

XLV.—1. *Antichrist: a Poem, with Notes and Sketches of Oriental Scenes. By the Rev.* H. NEWTON, *A.B.* Seeley, Burnside. and Seeley, 1847.

2. *The Flight of the Apostate: a Poem, in Three Parts. With Thoughts on our Present Pre-millennial State. By the Rev.* H. NEWTON, *B.A.* London: Wertheim and Macintosh. 1849.

How to deal with the Rev. H. Newton, and his works, in very sooth we know not. He is a gentleman of a fiery mood, apt to yield blow for blow with interest, and so wrathfully vigilant against all critical censures, however mild may be the shape they take, as to cause us to approach the theme with some degree of sacred awe, such as may be supposed to possess a heedless urchin, tempted to play with his master's rod, though the master may break in upon him at any moment, and lay it about his shoulders. Our unhappy contemporary, "The Morning Post," "just hesitated dislikes," most politely; and Mr. Newton has taken dire revenge, digging up the carcass, as he says himself, for the purpose of an awful post-mortem examination. "Wilful and deliberate falsehood," is the most kindly expression applied to the good critic's labours, who, to tell truth, had been excessively lenient, but had obviously only spared the rod to spoil the child. More detestable nonsense than Mr. Newton's verses, we never remember to have met with! And when we say this, let not Mr. Newton lay "the flattering unction to his soul," (as he, of course, *will* do, say what we may!) that we are secret beadsmen of the Pope, and sworn knights to the service of the Scarlet Lady. It does so happen that Mr. Newton's millennial notions, for the most part, tally very much with our own, though we could never undertake to define them with as much audacity as this adventurous gentleman. We shrink from speaking too boldly and too positively on matters which we *can* see only "through

a glass darkly." Not so Mr. Newton; he does not scruple to denounce the folly, and blindness, and so forth, of all those who differ from himself; and speaks of the future throughout his books, almost as if it were already past. Yet the prose in either of these volumes contains not a little to interest, and even to inform the mind, and seems infinitely removed from the extraordinary rubbish which Mr. Newton looks upon as poetry, and poetry of the very highest order! He tells us so in so many words, that there may be no mistake about it. What do our readers say to this rhapsody, extracted from "Imagination, at the Poet's Study," which occurs in the former of Mr. Newton's "works?" The said Newton is addressing the angels—we presume, of poesy:—

> "Angel power! inform,
> *What burning thoughts of imagery adorn*
> *My glowing page;* what shape of lightning storm
> *Electrifies?* &c. &c.
> ——— Whence, in tracing these,
> *Have I th' ineffable spiritual fire,*
> *To awe, to charm, to terrify, to please?"*

Whence indeed? And echo answers, "Whence?" This is excessively funny, yet we think it is surpassed by certain passages in "The Flight of the Apostate," wherein "the minstrel" descends to the judgment-hall of Antichrist, and gives Satan, Belial, and all their hosts, as hearty an intellectual drubbing, as he had bestowed upon the unhappy "Morning Post." But, in truth, the theme is too solemn to bandy jests about it, and, therefore, we refrain. Mr. Newton's idea of versification is marvellous. Crackjaw couplets in alternate rhymes, or "quatrains," as our author calls them, constitute the form he has every where selected; a form which may be acceptable in "Grey's Elegy," but becomes wholly insupportable in a longer poem. As a sample of the author's powers, we quote the opening of the first dedication "to Poetry:"—

> "Celestial angel fair! whose soaring flight
> *Wings along th' azure heaven's blue arching deep:*

(What a line have we here!)

> "Or in heaven's *ambient glooming infinite*

(Better again!)

> "Soaring, where nimblest wings of angels sweep
> *The starless expanse—or when stooping o'er*

(A rather lame flight this, we must own!)

> "Our world of waters from, a lowering night
> Of storm; *thou mov'st along the trembling roar*
> *Of thunder!*———"

But, "jam satis!" our readers will surely cry; and so we break off, leaving far more wondrous things unkenned. The honest truth is, that Mr. Newton has not the remotest notion of rhythm, and seems to lose the possession of his sober senses (in which fact he doubtless glories) as soon as he betakes himself to rhyme. Even whilst he is *talking* about his "poetry" in prose, "he wanders wide," or in other words, he raves; but, setting this verse-mania aside, we have no doubt he may be a very useful member of society, and are quite willing to yield all due attention to his exposition of his "scriptural views." Let him be assured that we write in sorrow, rather than in anger, and not confirm himself in his very extravagant mistake, because "The Church and State Gazette," and "The Hampshire Advertiser," applaud his bardic efforts! We must give our readers one more extract, but this shall be a prose one. "The author, having sent forth such an 'Antichrist,' was prepared for open and violent attack from *the real Antichrist's true supporters.*" (Of course! There *we* are branded: *well* may we shudder!)

"But" he confesses, "that, through long absence from England, and want of acquaintance *with the hidden mysteries of London reviewing*, he was not prepared for that which met his eyes! Albeit, he well knew that, wherever Antichrist is naturally exalted, his spirit of lies must overshadow the nation, *it was to him a matter of no little astonishment, that the same week or day should send forth on the same poem regarding the execution, and even on the same topics, the most flatly contradictory statements.*"

Marvellous, indeed, that any two men should differ as to the merits of any literary production! Every body knows that tastes never *do* differ,—so that if two critics contradict one another, one of them must have lied, and that too of malice prepense. Such is Mr. Newton's highly charitable and still more reasonable creed! So again, a little further on, our author is in ecstasies of admiration and anger at a criticiser, most supremely mild and kind, in "The Gentleman's Magazine," which must have been "false" and "malicious:" for why? because, "it was contradicted throughout by one which appeared in the 'Hampshire Advertiser.'" Was not this contradiction "a marvel and a mystery?" Is it not patent to the meanest understanding, even that of a Quarterly Reviewer, that the Jesuits must have been at work? But to leave this tone, one thing is quite patent to *us*, that kindness and pitiful leniency can be of no service whatever to poor Mr. Newton. He must be whipped, not coaxed, out of this poetic madness; and though we can afford no more time to the application of the knout, we must beseech the offender, in conclusion, not to desecrate such awful themes by

perpetrating such unmitigated rubbish respecting them. We really believe that there is that stuff in him which might yet prove of service to God's Church, rightly applied and developed; but we do adjure him, even by those sacred principles he professes to reverence, not to expose them to the scoff of the infidel and the laughter of the worldly-wise, and thus do his little all to establish that "kingdom of Antichrist" which he would wish so earnestly to overthrow. We now bid him farewell. When we meet him again, let it be in the paths of honest sober prose, in which he really may have a testimony to bear, "to this generation."

XLVI.—*Chapters on Deacons. By the Author of "Hymns and Scenes of Childhood."* London: Masters.

THIS is a very delightful volume. Its prose more especially charms us: with the poetry we could have dispensed, because, although prettyish, we do not think it rises to the level of its theme. The general tone of the book is thoroughly and healthfully Catholic, and most distinctly anti-papal. The chapter we like by far the least is that on "S. Benedict:" in fact we could wish this away. A very admirable section follows on "Cuthbert Sympson." Many of the suggestions of this authoress are most valuable; and altogether her little volume is a very welcome contribution to our literature for deacons and on deacons.

XLVII.—*The Theologian and Ecclesiastic.*
The Churchman's Companion.

BOTH these publications are issued by Mr. Masters, though they breathe a different spirit. The second is reverential, affectionate, charitable, Anglo-Catholic: of the first we cannot speak with satisfaction: it reminds us sometimes of the tone of the "British Critic." We would instance articles on "Stephens on the Book of Common Prayer" and on "the Dedication of Churches." There is some good in both these articles, but a loveless tone permeates them (more especially the second of the two); and they are calculated on the whole to effect more evil than benefit. "The Churchman's Companion," though containing too much second-rate versifying, and fabulous hagiography, has much more claim on our regard. We particularly like its articles under the heading of Church News. There is an article, too, in the November number on those lately deceased fellow-labourers in the vineyard, the Rev. G. Cornish, vicar of Kenwyn, and the Rev. R. Lampen, vicar of S. Probus, which for its simplicity and beauty can scarcely be extolled too highly. We also like the hearty, cheerful, loving tone, which rings like true metal, of the preface to the last volume, in the December Number, dated from Stoke Damerel. We are delighted to hear that there is one

Church at least where the Eucharist is daily offered, though we know not where that church may be; and we only trust that this glorious privilege is not marred by any miserable Romanizing in those who practise it.

XLVIII.—*The Ten Commandments. By the Author of "Hymns and Scenes of Childhood."*

A PRETTY little book, applying the spiritual sense of the commandments in simple verse for village, or indeed any, children. We could wish saint and virgin worship to have been especially protested against with reference both to the first and second commandment; and can only entreat the authoress not to be restrained from telling the truth, from any fear of man,—not even of her spiritual pastors. This would be selling her birthright, God's truth, for a mess of potage, man's praise.

XLIX.—*Ruins of Many Lands. A Descriptive Poem, by* NICHOLAS MICHELL, *Author of "The Traduced," &c. Second Edition.* London: Tegg.

THIS volume of poetry, though not inspired by the highest order of genius, is yet, on the whole, well written and pleasing. It is wholly descriptive; and to the young it will be found a useful and, as far as we see, an unexceptionable gift.

L.—1. *A Manual for the Study of the Sepulchral Slabs and Crosses of the Middle Ages. By the Rev.* EDWARD L. CUTTS, *B.A.* London: J. H. Parker.

2. *Christian Monuments of England and Wales. By the Rev.* C. BOUTELL. London: Bell.

THE first of these works, comprising as it does a series of engravings of flat and raised tomb-stones, and monumental crosses, arranged chronologically, and ranging in point of date from the fifth century down to the sixteenth, will be indispensable to all those who are interested in obtaining a superior style of monumental design to that which so generally disfigures our churchyards. There is a great want of taste in such matters; but we look to the clergy to encourage a better style of memorial by their influence in their respective parishes.

Mr. Boutell's work has a similar object. It is being published in parts, and is most beautifully executed, and will, we have no doubt, be most valuable to the student, and to the parish priest.

LI.—*Romanism as it exists at Rome. By the Hon.* J. W. PERCY. London: Seeleys.

THIS volume comprises a great number of curious inscriptions

copied at Rome by Mr. Percy, and illustrative of Romish superstitions. It well deserves study, and a longer notice than we can at present give it.

LII.—*Two Sermons on the Duty of Keeping the Lord's Day, and the manner in which it should be kept. By* RICHARD HARVEY, *M.A., Rector of St. Mary's, Hornsey, &c.* London: Groombridge.

IN this little publication the author enforces the doctrine of the continual obligation of the Sabbath, and the duties thence resulting. His argument is clear and convincing, and his exhortations are very effective.

LIII.—*The Nation, the Church, and the University of Oxford: Two Sermons preached before the University, in November*, 1849. *By* WILLIAM SEWELL, *B.D., Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College.* Oxford and London: J. H. Parker.

WE commend these noble Sermons, not merely to all who are directly interested in the Universities, but to the whole Church. We advise their perusal, not for the sake of their pure morality, their high philosophy, or their most eloquent truth; but for their enunciation of those great principles of action on which the welfare of the Universities and the Church in these times of trial depend. May the deep practical wisdom of the course recommended in these Sermons, be felt and recognized before it be too late! We tender our most earnest thanks to Mr. Sewell for the service he has thus rendered to the Church.

MISCELLANEOUS.

A GREAT variety of minor Publications are before us, to which we can only briefly advert at present, reserving such of them as we may deem expedient for more full notice hereafter. Amongst these we may mention "The Outlaw's Confession," and other Poems, by B. Fairclough (Cleaver), as rather pleasing; "Westminster Abbey," by O. Howell, also pleasing; and "California"—Stanzas by M. H. P. Hall—good; "Sacred Lyrics" (J. R. Smith), contains some pleasing lines; "The Magazine for the Young," (Mozley), a very nice publication; "Ten School-room Addresses," by J. P. Norris, M.A. (Rivingtons), very well done indeed; a remarkably nice portable "Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament," by Rev. T. S. Green (Bagsters); "A Review of the Mexican War, on Christian Principles," by the Rev. Philip Berry, A.B. (Columbia S. C.); "A Letter on the late Post-Office Agitation," by C. J. Vaughan, D.D. (Murray), containing a defence of the recent alteration; "Remarks on Mount Serbal being the true Mount Sinai," by J. Hogg, Esq. (Hughes and

Robinson), a learned and curious Essay; Mr. Macaulay's Character of the Clergy," by C. Babington, M.A. (Rivingtons), a very useful publication; "The Ecclesiastical and Architectural Topography of England"—Buckinghamshire (J. H. Parker),—a continuation of the series. "Remarks on Noble's Appeal in behalf of the doctrines of Swedenborg" (Richardson),—a Romish publication; Charges by Archbishop Whately, and Archdeacon Manning; both on the subject of education;—the one upholding the Government scheme of Education in Ireland, the other in opposition to similar tendencies here: "Auricular Confession," a Letter from Kappa to Delta (Davy); "The Judgment of Charity," by Rev. T. Vores, urging the hypothetical interpretation of the Baptismal Service; "A Letter to Charles W. Packe, Esq., M.P., on the Desirableness and Necessity of a Church Association in Parliament," by the Rev. F. Merewether, M.A. (Rivingtons), an excellent and important pamphlet, well worthy of attention and circulation; "Tracts and Thoughts for the Additional Curates' Aid Society, Manchester" (Hatchards), disapproving of Mr. Leigh's conduct; "The Holy Eucharist," by Rev. J. Marshall (Edinburgh)—an attack on the Appeal of the Rev. W. Palmer, of Magdalene College, to the Scottish Church; "The Book of the Prophet Joel" (Bagster), a specimen of the Hebrew Bible arranged on the system of parallelism; "A Memoir of a Sunday Scholar," by Rev. A. D. Newell (Rivingtons)—a tract which ought to be circulated in parishes; "Baptism accompanied by Conditional and Unconditional Grace," by Rev. C. R. Cameron (Wertheim), an attempt to reconcile conflicting opinions; "The Shadow of the Future," by a Layman (Rivingtons), a work on prophecy giving the prophecies of Daniel and St. John, with their explanation in a columnar form; "The Bible of Every Land" (Bagster), a very curious work, now coming out in numbers, giving specimens of every version of the Bible, with notes; "The Day of Prayer and the Day of Thanksgiving" two excellent sermons by Rev. J. Jackson (Skeffington); Sermons (4) "On the Calling of a Medical Student," by Rev. E. W. Plumptre (J. W. Parker); "Twelve Short Sermons for Family Reading," by Rev. J. Atkinson (Longmans)—an excellent series; the Rev. A. J. Dayman's Sermon, "The Houses of God," &c. (Rivingtons), an unfortunate publication, and by no means well-judged; an *excellent* sermon by Rev. R. S. Savage, "On the Ministerial Office" (Rivingtons); "An Ordination Sermon," by Rev. C. E. Kennaway; "Family Worship," a Sermon, by Rev. J. D. Jefferson; Rev. J. G. Shepherd's Sermon on "Public Prayer;" "The Kingdom of God," a Sermon, by Rev. T. Lowe, M.A. Other publications, now before us, we must defer noticing till next Number.

Foreign and Colonial Intelligence.

Australia.—*Protest of the Bishop of Adelaide against Popish Intrusion.*—The following appears in the *John Bull*:—"The Popish Bishop of South Australia having issued a public appeal for a subscription to the fund which is being collected for the Pope in all parts of the world, with the title 'Catholic Bishop of Adelaide' appended to his signature, the Bishop of Adelaide, Dr. Short, has promulgated an official protest, with the concurrence of the Diocesan Chapter. The following are the documents:—

"'Augustus, by divine permission, Bishop of Adelaide, and pursuant to the letters patent of Her Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria, bearing date at Westminster, June 25, 1847, ordinary pastor of the Diocese of Adelaide.—To the Clergy and all the Faithful in this Diocese, grace and peace be multiplied.

"'Dearly beloved Brethren—Whereas it hath been brought to our notice that alms have been solicited for the purpose of supporting the Bishop of Rome in his pretended claim to carry on the government of the Universal Church, such claim being contrary to the Word of God, the primitive order of the Catholic Church, and the law of England, affirming the Queen's Majesty to be, under God, within her dominions, supreme in all causes and over all persons, ecclesiastical or civil; and whereas such claim, and all jurisdiction, superiority, or pre-eminence emanating therefrom, under any such style or title of Catholic Bishop of Adelaide, has, by solemn protest, bearing date March 25, 1843, been dissented from, and contradicted by the Right Reverend William Grant, Bishop of Adelaide, our predecessor, now Metropolitan of Australasia, Tasmania, and New Zealand: we, feeling in duty bound to maintain the lawful supremacy of our Lady the Queen, the canonical order of the Catholic Church, publicly wounded at this time by the pretended universal jurisdiction of the See of Rome, the rights of it by law established in England and Ireland, as well as those of ourselves and successors, Bishops of Adelaide, do hereby publicly protest against any and every act of episcopal authority done, or to be done, at any time by any person whatever, by virtue of any right or title derived from the assumed claim of the said Bishop of Rome to ecclesiastical sovereignty. Fare ye well.—Augustus, by Divine permission, and favour of our Sovereign Lady the Queen, Lord Bishop of Adelaide.

"'Given at Adelaide, Tuesday, the 3rd day of July, 1849.'

"'We, the undersigned Presbyters, duly licensed, within the diocese and jurisdiction of the See of Adelaide, having been summoned by the Lord Bishop of Adelaide, to advise with him concerning the matter referred to in the above protest, and having maturely considered the same in Chapter assembled, do heartily concur in the said protest, and recommend its being publicly read in the Cathedral

Church, on Sunday, July 8th, at morning prayer, after the Nicene creed. — James Farrell, Dean of Adelaide; Matthew B. Hale, Archdeacon of Adelaide; W. J. Woodcock, Canon; T. P. Wilson, Canon.'"

The Precedency Question at Sydney.—The same paper has, in an extract from the *Sydney Guardian*, the following statement:—"Only two clergymen—one of them unlicensed—attended the levee on the Queen's birthday, an intimation having been conveyed to his Excellency the Governor, that in consequence of the extraordinary and anomalous position assigned to the Metropolitan Bishop of Sydney, and the Clergy of the Church of England, by the precedency given to Dr. Polding, by reason of the title of Archbishop, bestowed on him by the foreign Bishop of Rome—those whose loyalty to the Queen, and respect to her Representative, would have naturally led them to Government House on that day, could not be present, without both giving sanction to a principle directly subversive of constitutional right, and at the same time allowing the pre-eminence and authority to a foreign power which, in their oath of the Queen's supremacy, they had sworn to deny. We trust the laity, as well as the Clergy, will not let the matter rest here. Many laymen, we know, did absent themselves on the same occasion; and in compliance with an intimation to that effect, an address, we are happy to add, is now in course of signature, expressive of the reasons for their absence, of which we subjoin a copy:—

"'May it please your Excellency,—

"'We the undersigned, members of the United Church of England and Ireland, beg to assure your Excellency of our unfeigned regret that we should have been compelled to be absent from your Excellency's Levee, held on the 24th inst., in honour of Her Majesty's birthday.

"'The unconstitutional edict which forced upon your Excellency the necessity of then publicly surrendering to an intruding Bishop, owing his title to a Foreign Power, precedence of the lawfully constituted Metropolitan of the Province of Australasia, thereby conceding to the Church of Rome a pre-eminence, contrary no less to the discipline of the Church at large than alien to the spirit of the British law, compelled us at the same time to decide that the honour of waiting upon your Excellency, under such circumstances, could be enjoyed only by a compromise of our allegiance as English Churchmen.

"'Your Excellency will be pleased, therefore, to accept, through the medium of this address, those warm assurances of fidelity and loyalty which we had anxiously desired personally to offer.

"'With our earnest hopes that instructions from Her Majesty the Queen may speedily restore to your Excellency's Court the Bishops and Clergy of this Province, and to their people the happy duty of approaching your Excellency with their lawful pastors on every occasion on which loyalty shall demand their presence,

"'We beg to subscribe ourselves, your Excellency's faithful and dutiful servants, [Signatures.]'"

CANADA.—*Convocation of King's College.*—An extraordinary and melancholy interest attaches this year to the convocation of King's College, Toronto, being the last year of that solemnity taking place under its present constitution. There were, it appears, already indications perceptible of the coming change. We extract the following, from the account given of the proceedings by the *Toronto Patriot*:—

"The proceedings closed with an address from His Excellency, which riveted the utmost attention. He paid the highest compliment to the institution—pointed out in beautiful and forcible language the advantages to be anticipated from the pursuit of knowledge for itself, without any reference to the spirit of acquisitiveness which pervades so deeply the present age. His reference to the ideas excited by the view and recollection of the classic cities, hallowed by the thoughts of the philosophers, poets, and orators who once taught and sung there; and the comparison between them and the feelings excited by the commercial cities of Tyre and Carthage, was a splendid burst of oratory. Having no notes, we cannot trust our memory with even a sketch of this magnificent address. A passing allusion to the Annexation folly was the only bit of politics introduced, and even that was so slight as to escape the observation of many. We feel assured, that however opinions may be divided about political affairs, those present that day cannot forget the excellent speech delivered at King's College by its noble Chancellor, and we trust that not the least pleasureable recollection to him will be the day that he took part in its proceedings.

"Some painful ideas, however, force themselves upon the mind. When the noble Chancellor, in feeling terms, pointed out to some of the young gentlemen the importance of carrying religious feelings with them into the world, and expressed his conviction that the value of such institutions depends on the high tone of mind imparted, he could not have recollected that in less than three months all religious teaching would be banished from King's College—that the Act under which this change is to take place states in its preamble the importance of the University being conducted on Christian principles, and yet banishes every semblance of religion from its precincts by expressly excluding nearly all ecclesiastics from its management, on the single ground of their being ecclesiastics—and that some of the highest honours bestowed at this very time were connected with religious teaching. Talents and diligence like Mr. McKenzie's and Mr. Evans's will meet at the Toronto University with no encouragement in those pursuits which tend most to ennoble the mind of man, and raise to the highest moral dignity, by the contemplation of the wisdom and love of the all-wise and supremely benevolent Creator!

"We cannot but lament that the obvious tendency of the New University Act is, to bring about the very evils which His Excellency so feelingly deprecated, and to overthrow the very advantages which the system hitherto pursued has been so successful in developing."

The *Toronto Church* adds:—

"The Convocation presented many features, gratifying to the lover

of purely secular learning. As the noble Chancellor observed, the attainments of the members of the institution would have insured them 'high standing in honours, either in Oxford or Cambridge.' But the pious Churchman must have been pained to mark the anxious jealousy with which the most distant allusion to Christianity was guarded against by the more prominent speakers. Eloquently did Lord Elgin eulogize the literary treasures of Greece and Rome; but the sectarian malaria which pervaded the scene prevented him from dwelling upon that knowledge which is 'eternal life,' and, divorced from which, all other learning is worse than useless. With this sad exception—for the sin of which he was not chargeable—His Excellency appeared to great advantage, and worthily sustained the reputation which he has earned, of profound and elegant scholarship.

"At the dinner, by some unaccountable overlook, the name of the Lord Bishop of Toronto had not been included in the list of toasts. This omission was as far as possible supplied by his Worship the Mayor, who, in returning thanks for the toast of the City Corporation, took occasion to characterize, in terms at once eloquent and truthful, the services rendered by the Right Reverend Prelate to that University, which apparently had forgotten his very existence. Most grateful must the worthy President have been to his Worship, for thus affording him an opportunity of discharging a duty, the neglect of which would have cast a stigma upon the proceedings of the evening.

"Chief Justice Robinson spoke with the graceful boldness of the Churchman and the Christian gentleman, in denouncing the new Act which rejected religion, as a leprous thing, from the halls of the University. The ears of not a few of his expediency-worshipping auditors must have tingled under the concluding words of this excellent man, which echoed through the hall like a warning Ichabod—"How can we expect the blessing of God upon it [the University], when every trace of His worship is determinedly cast off!"

China.—*American Mission at Shanghai.*—The following extracts from the report of Bishop Boone, to the Board of Missions, respecting the operation of the Mission at Shanghai, will be read with interest:—

"The school is doing well, and has contributed its quota of those who are, as we trust, in penitence and faith, seeking the salvation of their souls; three of the number being from among its members. As the boys increase in age, and advance in their studies, we are made, in that proportion, to feel the need of a layman to aid in carrying on its operations; indeed, male superintendence is becoming every day more and more indispensable. Shall we call in vain upon all the young laymen of the Church, for aid in so important a work—a work which, although but just commenced, is already bearing fruit to the glory of our Divine Master?

"I am persuaded that, if our young men, whose hearts' desire is to live for the advancement of our Saviour's cause, only knew what an opportunity is afforded them in this school, of influencing the future progress of the Gospel in China, at least so far as it shall please God

to make the exertions of our own Church instrumental to this end, they would press forward in numbers, eagerly demanding of the Foreign Committee their passports to China. . . . .

"We are so fully persuaded that we shall not do all for the Chinese that our position and their necessities demand of us, if we content ourselves with merely teaching the adults among them, *vivâ voce*, and by means of books, that we have determined to get as many native schools under our control and direction as possible. For this purpose we offer to Chinese teachers a bonus of one dollar per annum for each boy; in compensation for which we claim the right to direct the studies of the boys, to have the Scriptures and our Catechism studied, in addition to the Chinese classics, and to have prayers and other religious exercises whenever it may suit us to visit the school. Of course there is no attempt to teach the English language in these schools. Last year we had one such school, under the care of Mr. Syle. This year we shall endeavour to increase the number—ultimately we shall hope to have two or three under the care and superintendence of each presbyter, as part of his parochial charge, that our blessed Lord's injunction to feed the lambs, as well as the sheep of his flock, may be attended to.

"We have one candidate for Orders, Chae, the youth who accompanied me to the United States. He continues stedfast in his desire to serve the Lord in the ministry of the Gospel, and we trust that, towards the close of this year, he will be found 'apt and meet to exercise the office of a deacon, to the honour of God and the edifying of his Church.' He is at present very usefully employed in aiding in the distribution of the alms of the Church, visiting the sick, aged, and infirm; and in assisting to superintend the Chinese school above mentioned. . . . ."

France.—*Provincial Councils.*—A striking feature in the attitude which the French Church has assumed since the Revolution, is the independence with which she has *de facto* vindicated her right to hold synods according to the ancient canonical system of the Church Catholic. The initiative in this important movement was taken by the Archbishop of Paris, who, without any previous warning, save a semi-official intimation, a few days before, in the *Ami de la Religion*, issued on "The Feast of the Nativity of Mary," the 8th of September, a circular to all the priests and religious communities of his diocese, demanding their prayers for the success of the Provincial Council, shortly to be held at Paris. It is a singular feature in the case, worthy to be specially noted, that not only this circular is dated of the "feast of the Nativity" of the Virgin, but that the "holy enterprise" was expressly placed by the Archbishop "under the protection of Mary," whom he requires to be "invoked and supplicated, in order that she may obtain for the Council, from her Divine Son, Jesus Christ, all the graces of which the Council shall stand in need."

This independent proceeding took the republican government by surprise; and as the Council was convoked for the 17th, the Minister of Agriculture and Commerce, charged *ad interim* with the portfolio of public instruction and worship, had barely time, on the 16th, to present

to the President of the Republic a report, informing him that the proposed ecclesiastical assemblies required the express sanction of the executive; which sanction was given on the selfsame day by a decree of the President conceived in terms sufficiently autocratic, but regarded with sovereign contempt by the Popish hierarchy, whose measures were taken altogether irrespectively of the secular power, and would, no doubt, have been proceeded with, if the decree in question had not been promulgated.

The Council for the Province of Paris was opened on September 17th, at the seminary of *Saint Sulpice*, and continued to sit till the 28th. The decrees which it promulgated were on the following subjects :—

1. *De Auctoritate summi Pontificis.* 2. *De Dignitate Episcoporum.* 3. *De Obligationibus Episcoporum.* 4. *De Metropolitano ac Suffraganeis.* 5. *De Concilio Provinciali.* 6. *De Capitulis Cathedralibus.* 7. *De Parochis ac eorum Vicariis.* 8. *De Unitate Servanda in ritibus ac cærimoniis.*

Since then, similar Councils have been held in the Provinces of Reims, Tours, (where the Archbishop took the Jesuit Ravignan with him as his theologian,) Soissons, and Avignon ; and others, it appears, are about to be convened.

A new Schism.—A new reformer has risen up in the Romish Church in France, in the person of an Abbé Chantome, who has addressed a petition to the Pope for a variety of ecclesiastical reforms. The following are the principal points of his petition :—That the education of the Clergy be public, in secular schools chosen by the Catholics, where they may become acquainted with public life, and learn to love the institutions of their country, upon a well-harmonized system of Catholic or universal science, embracing the arts and every branch of human science. That preaching be not left by the Bishops to the parochial Clergy, in an anarchical state both as to subject and method. That public worship be recalled to its ancient forms, and that the French language be gradually admitted into all parts of the Liturgy specially destined for the people. That the use of Communion in two kinds be re-established. That all ecclesiastical vestments be restored to their ancient patterns. That the old *agapæ* or repasts taken in common in the parishes be restored. That in imitation of the middle ages halls be opened for the representation of national or religious historical dramas. That the Church renounce all endowments, and refuse the salaries proffered by the State. That the principle of the *solidarité* of Catholics in regard to their property be proclaimed by the Church. Another reformer, of a still more advanced character, the Abbé Anatole Leray, holds up Father Ventura as " the living personification of the Catholic idea, and announces himself as " a Socialist, who will have no more aristocracy, titles, money, classes, or offices.' "

Turkey.—*State of the American Church Mission.*—The *New York Churchman* publishes, from the *Spirit of Missions*, the Report of Bishop Southgate to the Board of Missions, which, as it exhibits the actual

condition of that interesting but, we fear, failing Mission of the American Church, we give it here *in extenso*:—

"*Fifth Annual Report of the Right Rev. Horatio Southgate, D.D., Missionary Bishop at Constantinople.*

"Dear Brethren,—In looking back upon the past year, I find abundant cause for gratitude. I have seen the field of the Mission's influence, for a time, at least, enlarging, the number of its friends increasing, and the sphere of its usefulness widened. In almost every department, there was, during the early part of the year, a decided advance. In education, I increased the number of my students; while the numerous applications which I received from others whom I could not take, evinced how strong was the interest felt by our Eastern brethren in this new department of labour. From my pupils, generally, I received tokens of decided advancement, both in religious and secular learning. This department I have been much urged to enlarge, and several have pressed upon me the importance of adding to it a female seminary. This I should be most happy to do, but the day for such large efforts seems not to be close at hand.

"In Mossoul, also, the department of education was enlarged by Kas Michael's taking charge of the new Syrian school, which was established early in the year by the benefactions of our Church, and partly sustained by them. With more than a hundred scholars chosen out of the Syrian community, with an enlightened and devoted Deacon under him as teacher; with the approbation of the Bishop, and the unanimous consent and gratitude of the people for his support, he seemed to have the prospect of great good. The letters which reached me from that city, during the first half of the year, gave most encouraging testimony of the wideness and promising character of the field. They were sometimes signed by Bishop, clergy, and laity, all of whom entreated me, in the most ardent manner, to take the work of their instruction into my own hands.

"Kas M. also added to his labours in Mossoul (which, besides attendance at this school, consisted in instruction in his own house,) a field in the mountainous district north-west of Mossoul, where he found a body of Nestorian Christians belonging to the Southern or Mesopotamian Church, who seem to have never before been visited by a missionary. He says of them, that they received him with open arms. He preached among them; opened schools; sent thither another clergyman, who is now there, acting as teacher, and who is represented to me as a pious and excellent man; has himself visited the mountains three times; and desires to enlarge his labours there by the addition of six other schools, which can be supported, exclusive of books and stationery, for about eighteen dollars, or three dollars each a month. This is a field in which I have always felt the deepest interest, and which has always offered the most decided encouragement. I should be glad to see the Church enlarging her efforts there. I have had no direct communication with the Syrian Patriarch during the year, but I

have had assurances of his sanction, and of the continuance of his long-preserved friendship. I heartily recommend to the Board this interesting and important field, and I would beg again to suggest the desirableness of our having at least one clergyman of our own Church there.

"In the department of publication, the Prayer Book in Armenian was out at the time of my last annual report, but the distribution of it has been chiefly within the past year. I have had the most encouraging tokens of its success, both in gaining the approbation of clergy and laity, and in doing good among them. I have met with no exception, in the Armenian Church, to its kind and friendly reception. All have seemed pleased with it, and many have voluntarily given me their thanks, and expressed their joy at its appearance. I cannot but think that it will be a minister of great good. Many evidences have come to my knowledge that it has been so already. In addition to the facts which I have reported on this subject through the *Spirit of Missions*, I may mention one which, as it is of very recent occurrence, is now particularly upon my mind. The rector of a church, (a man already holding reformed views in many respects, but who, for want of a guide, found his mind entirely unsettled as to the course which he ought to take,) upon reading our Prayer Book, was so impressed with the excellency, and purity, and primitive simplicity of its doctrines and rites, that he determined to make it his model in all his efforts in behalf of the improvement of his people, and has accordingly collected from his congregation the most intelligent and most advanced, to whom he is communicating his views, and forming them into an association, for the purpose of gradually bringing their own practice in accordance with the guide which he has chosen. His preaching, I am told, is eminently evangelical, and himself advancing daily in the knowledge and love of the truth. To this I might add many other instances if the limits of my report would allow it.

"With the Prayer Book has generally been circulated my little Treatise on the Anglican Church, which I have found useful in leading the way to the Prayer Book, and preparing men's minds to receive the latter with a stronger relish. It has been useful, too, as setting forth, in a brief and summary manner, the peculiarities of our branch of the Church Catholic, and thus leading men to an idea of what a reformed Church should be. I have great cause for gratitude that I have been permitted to prepare it, and for acknowledgment to the excellent Society, (our own P. E. Tract Society,) which has aided me in publishing it.

"I have also re-written the same treatise, had it translated into Greek, and am now on the point of publishing it for the benefit of our Greek brethren, among whom there has been a much-increased degree of inquiry during the past year. The number of Prayer Books circulated among them has been larger than any former year. I have distributed, of these and other works published by, or kept in the depository of, the Mission, several hundreds—perhaps twelve or fifteen hundred.

"With regard to personal and general intercourse with our Eastern brethren, I have, as in former years, seen the great advantages of it. This intercourse, the last year, has been less than usual; but still, I suppose, that in hundreds of cases, sometimes in my own house, sometimes abroad, the Gospel has been preached, the Church defined, the corruptions of the Church designated, distinguished, and resisted, a true and healthful reformation urged, and men's minds awakened to the subject. These discussions, conversations, and efforts have been with the highest as well as the lowest, sometimes in large companies, sometimes in the solitary interview in private. They have been cheering to me, as indicating, in many instances, the readiness with which the truth is received, and the facility of proclaiming it. I have much hope from such efforts: but still I think that the true, legitimate, and most hopeful way of effecting large and permanent results, is by training those who may hereafter become the agents of good to their own nation. This I have endeavoured to do with the few students I have had, and this was my design in the larger effort of that kind which I have had in view.

"But I am obliged to speak of these things as passed; for my educational labours are now almost entirely abandoned, and will soon be so altogether. I am obliged to say the same of the work of distribution and publication, and of the efforts of the Mission at Mossoul, so far as I am concerned. All these things are, in a manner, passed, and my own hopes of usefulness in them are, for the present, at an end. This leads me to speak of what has been disadvantageous in the history of the last year; believing that I am equally bound by the Canon to report what is adverse as what is favourable. (See Can. VII. sec. 7, of 1844.) I shall, therefore, present to the Board an account of the reverses of the past year, as, without them, you could have no accurate view of 'the state of the Mission under my supervision.'

"I will commence with the first department of those of which I have just spoken—that of Education. My design was to enlarge this, until it should contain as many students as I could attend to. These were not to be children, nor was the institution a 'school,' in the common acceptation of the word. It was rather a seminary for training a select number of young men for the work of Christ within their own churches. The patriarch has given it his approbation and his express sanction to the students to attend the services of our Church. I announced this design, I believe, for the first time, at the last triennial meeting of the Board. A few months later I had two students. The introduction of the new financial system, as it created some confusion in my plans, prevented me for several months from further enlarging the number. I then ventured to add a third, while the earnest applications that were poured in upon me showed me how highly the effort was appreciated.

"Soon after the middle of last year, means for the support of the few I had, began altogether to fail. From the first of August, for some months, my receipts from the Foreign Treasury did not equal a third of

my own salary, which, when entire, barely suffices for my support. From the first of July to the end of the year—a space of six months—the sum received for that period was 277 dollars, 58 instead of 2000, the appropriation for the period. It soon became apparent that, so far from enlarging the number of my students, I could not retain those that I had. As the expense on account of them was regular, nothing could provide for them but a regular receipt of remittances. But the amount received for the whole six months barely exceeded a third of my salary for the same time. I held on, however, until my own means utterly failed, and I finally abandoned the idea of maintaining students only when I came to find that winter was near, clothes would be necessary, and I had not even the means of giving them their daily bread. It had become evident to me that it would be impossible for me to carry out the scheme of education which I had formed before the new financial system commenced. I therefore abandoned it, declined to receive any more students, and retained only one that I had, until I could determine upon some mode of obtaining an education for him, which his high promise made me especially anxious to secure in his behalf.

"The like, or nearly the like, occurred at Mossoul. In 1847, I had promised the Bishop and his people that I would undertake a work among them, relying then on the expected appropriation of the next year. When July, 1848, came, that appropriation almost entirely failed. I did something for the Syrians during the first half of the year, but the irregularity of remittances even then considerably affected my plans. But when the last half of the year came, and I was left almost entirely destitute, I was compelled to neglect Mossoul. This offended the people there, who regarded it as a violation of promise, as, *literally*, it was. The Bishop became alienated, so that, after the first half of the year was gone, we lost much of our vantage-ground. The Bishop ceased to correspond with me, and it was wholly out of my power to make him understand the changes and crises in our financial arrangements at home. I do not mean that he is permanently disaffected, but that both he and his people seem to be vexed, and I know not whether we can regain the confidence we have lost. I presume, however, that we can, without much difficulty. Indeed, I will be responsible for that, under a different system; but I cannot safely be responsible for any thing under the present arrangement.

"Before, however, coming to that point, I have a few more words to say of the effects of this arrangement. I have been desired and besought by Kas Michael to aid him in his efforts among the interested body of Nestorians that he has found. If I had my appropriation, and had it regularly, I could do this. I can now do nothing. He has appointed a teacher, and wishes to appoint others, but I have no security for paying them regularly, and could undertake such a work only with the prospect of being soon embarrassed by arrears of appropriation remaining unpaid. Kas M., in his last letter, under date of January 8th, states the matter as follows:—

" ' Last year, you wrote, and ordered me to go to the mountains[1], and report to you about the state of the community of the Nestorian Christians, and whether there was an opening for establishing schools for the improvement of the spiritual state of the people. I lost no time performing my duty, and, instead of once, I went three times among them [2], and found the Nestorians very anxious for instruction. Their priests are like the generality, ignorant and poor, occupying themselves in agricultural pursuits; and all the villagers are poor, and cannot provide for a school. I represented to you formerly that these schools want money to pay the schoolmasters, and paper for writing, &c. &c.; for, without some assistance in money, my labour will be in vain.

" ' In one of my former letters, I told you about Ishaya, another monk from Rabban Hormuzd, (a convert from Popery,) who came to me. I took him to the mountains, and opened a school among the Nestorians, and asked you to fix him a small salary. But I have received no answer; and only a few days ago I received a letter from Ishaya, stating that he had about twenty children in the school, beside several full-grown men, who came for a few hours every day to receive instruction; but he complains of poverty and want of money for his support.

" ' Last year you wrote me that you would remit me some money, but I am waiting in vain, and am now at a loss what to do. With respect to schools, if you would appropriate 500 piastres (about twenty-one dollars) per month, I could support seven schools in the mountains. Shemmas (Deacon) Ishaya would be content with eighty piastres (about three dollars) a month.

" ' Last week another monk left the convent of Rabban Hormuzd, and came to me. He wishes to join us, and tells me that there are three others very anxious to come. If you take the matter into consideration, and can make some provision for schools, I will accept these individuals, and make schoolmasters of them.

" ' Now I entreat you to send me a decided answer as soon as possible, that I may be able to go to the mountains shortly; for, without money in my hand, I will appear very awkward; for the schools have now been opened for several months, and have not received a farthing from me. I trust you will not forget the communion-service you promised to send me, and excuse all the trouble I am giving you.'

" To resume: My book-distributing department has suffered, if not equally, at least severely. The small expense which it requires, I was unable, during the last half of last year, to afford; and, finally, as it was wholly out of my power to pay the monthly rent of my depository with regularity, I was obliged to abandon it.

" I might say the same of my intercourse with the people; but I will not enlarge.

[1] There is a slight inaccuracy here; I sanctioned the journey after it had taken place, when I first heard of it. The matter, however, is of no importance, excepting for the sake of exactness.

[2] The second and third journeys were under instructions from me.

"And now, if I say, brethren, that, with all these details, I have given but a very imperfect view of the reverses which have befallen the Mission the past year, you will be prepared, I doubt not, for what I am about to add.

"After long and careful deliberation—after an experience of more than a year, which experience was not necessary to convince me of the probable effects of our new fiscal arrangements—I must say, in all simplicity, honesty, and frankness, that I cannot carry on the Mission of the Church in this country under them. It is simply an impossibility.

"Neither can I enter into controversy on the subject. I have been led, by the action of the Board at the last Annual Meeting—(prescribing that no change be made in our present missionary organization)—to the conclusion to which my mind has long been tending, viz., that the Mission is to be henceforth under the direction of the Foreign Committee. I fully concur in the action of the Board on this subject. I believe that to take a Mission from the hands of the regularly constituted authorities of the Church, would be to place it in a disadvantageous and abnormal position, which would be highly injurious to it. I feel convinced that we had better not undertake any missionary labours which we cannot undertake through our constitutional agency. I have regarded this Mission, therefore, since the last meeting of the Board, as under the direction of the Foreign Committee, and I cannot give my assent to its being hereafter removed from their jurisdiction. There cannot, therefore, be any discrepancy between them and me; their will, as the directing power during the recess of the Board, must prevail. This is the only condition on which I shall feel at liberty in future to carry on the Missions of the Board in this country; and this condition absolutely prohibits me from engaging in any opposition to the Foreign Committee. Nor could I accept a system of financial policy in which they did not cordially concur; since this would be to put us at variance again.

"I would, therefore, respectfully suggest to the Board, that the subject of this portion of my Report be not made a topic of consideration at the Annual Meeting; but that it be left to the Foreign Committee and myself to confer upon it during my visit to America, which now seems indispensable. If I should succeed, as I think there is some hope of my doing, through a plan which has occurred to me, and which is not wholly inconsistent with the present system, I shall be most happy to continue the work of the Board in this country. Otherwise I must not hesitate to make the sacrifice which a failure of success on this point would seem to require of me.

"I am truly happy, in conclusion, to declare my belief in the rectitude of the Committee's intentions. I have no doubt that they have acted as they believed to be best for the interests of the Missions committed to them. I have no doubt that they will so act in future. In remarking upon the effects of the new system, I do not complain of them. I did not complain of them the last year in the sense that was supposed. My report was greatly misunderstood on this point. But,

inasmuch as that misunderstanding arose, doubtless, from something unfortunate in my mode of expression, I humbly take the entire blame of it to myself. At present, also, my only wish has been to state the effects of the system upon this Mission, as illustrative of its state during the past year, and my own course in consequence. I have done this without a single hard feeling towards any one—which I do not at all entertain.

"Finally, that you, dear brethren, and the Foreign Committee and myself, in our respective spheres, may be guided by wisdom from on high, and especially by God-like charity, is the humble and earnest prayer of

"Your fellow-labourer and servant in Christ,

"HORATIO SOUTHGATE,

"*Constantinople, April* 2, 1849. "Missionary Bishop, &c.

"POSTSCRIPT.

"*Constantinople, May* 4, 1849.

"*To the Board of Missions of the P. E. Church:*

"Dear Brethren,—In writing my Annual Report, my expectation was to receive the means of visiting the United States very shortly. But I have been disappointed in this, and now it seems hardly possible to leave before fall. Moreover, if the present financial arrangement continue, it will not be possible to leave then, for the plan of remitting funds after they are actually in the treasury, requires that I receive them long after the time for which they are due, so that they are expended before they come to hand, and cannot, therefore, be used for a journey.

"It seems, then, necessary to bring this subject before the Board. I would have much preferred the plan suggested in my Report, viz., that it be left to the Foreign Committee and myself; but, as this now appears impracticable, I would respectfully request your attention to it.

"I see no way in which I can propose the matter to you besides that which it would, in all probability, have taken, if I had been able at this time to visit America. I allude to my resignation. I see not how this is to be avoided. The Committee have informed me that they feel bound to maintain the new financial system; the Secretary adds, that it is a matter of necessity with them to do so. It is clear to my own mind that I am not able to conduct a Mission to this country successfully under such an arrangement. I had thought of proposing another plan, to which I made allusion in my Annual Report. But, besides that, I had little hope, at first, that it would prove acceptable to the Committee. I now see, from the course that contributions and remittances are taking the present year, that it cannot be adopted without abandoning the principle of the new system. It would, therefore, be useless to suggest it.

"It remains, then, that the arrangement established by the Foreign Committee must stand, unless set aside by the Board. I am convinced

that such a proceeding on the part of the Board would not be advantageous to the Mission. No scheme is desirable which has not the concurrence of those who are to execute it. I have, moreover, pledged myself to the Committee, not to act in opposition to them in this matter. The general grounds of this promise are contained in a letter to the Foreign Secretary, dated Sept. 18, 1848. I cannot, therefore, come in conflict with the Committee; and, as they are settled in the conviction that it is their duty to continue the new arrangement, no course is left me but to retire.

"I do, therefore, humbly and respectfully resign to the Board all the charge and responsibility concerning their operations in this country. I do this with profound gratitude to them for their many acts of kindness, and for the support which they have almost uniformly vouchsafed to me.

"It remains only to provide for my return. I propose to leave about the first of October. I would, therefore, respectfully desire that the appropriation to that date be forwarded to me, together with the sum of one thousand dollars in addition, for the necessary preparation, and for the journey. I intend to sustain the Mission till the time of my departure, and to pay the salaries of my assistants here and at Mossoul to the end of the year. It will be very desirable that the funds just mentioned be in my hands by the first of September, and, in order to this, they should be forwarded from the United States by the middle of July. I beg the particular attention of the Board to the necessity of providing for these expenditures at the Annual Meeting.

"It will be for the Board to decide whether their operations in this country shall continue. In case of their continuance, I would beg to recommend to you the Rev. Presbyter in Mossoul, and the lay-assistant in this city, whom I shall leave in service at the time of my departure. They have both been faithful and successful in their endeavours on our behalf.

"I remain, dear Brethren,
"Your humble and grateful servant,
"Horatio Southgate,
"Missionary Bishop, &c."

The Bishop, in conformity with the intention expressed in this report, has left Constantinople. He arrived with his family at New York on the 6th of November.

United States.—*Meeting of the New York Convention.*—The Annual Convention of the diocese of New York was opened on the 26th of September last. Among the subjects discussed was the necessity of enforcing the canon for collections to be made in aid of the diocesan funds; when it was stated that, from want of confidence in the Committee which has the administration of the funds, the enforcement of the canon would prove nugatory, as the congregations would not contribute; and it was ultimately resolved to appoint a new Committee. The next important subject was the proposed alteration in the third article of the Constitution, approved by the Convention at the

last Annual Meeting, viz. "The Convention shall be composed of the officiating ministers, being regularly admitted and settled in some church within this diocese which is in union with this Convention; and of lay members, *who shall be communicants*, consisting of one, *and not more than three* delegates from each church, to be chosen by the vestry or congregation; and clergymen employed as missionaries under the direction of this Convention, and clergymen engaged as professors or instructors of youth in any college, academy, or general seminary of learning duly incorporated, may be members of the Convention."

The words in italics are the amendments.

In opposition to this motion an amendment was moved to this effect, —That the further consideration of the subject be postponed until there was a Bishop in the chair of the Convention, on the ground that most of the difficulties under which the Church in Eastern New York laboured, were to be attributed to a paralysis of that member of the diocese, in the existence of whom was found the principal difference of the Convention from a presbyterian synod, and that so important a matter as the one proposed to be decided should not be decided on in the absence of a Bishop, in a maimed Convention.

After a protracted discussion, the postponement was carried by the following votes:—

Clergy,—ayes, 62; noes, 48. Laity,—ayes, 76; noes, 28.

Several other proposals for amendments in the new article of the constitution were then made; but the opinions becoming more and more discordant as the discussion proceeded, it was ultimately agreed to let the whole matter lie on the table.

By far the most important subject, however, which occupied the Convention, was the course proposed to be taken for the relief of the diocese from its present difficulties, by reason of the indefinite suspension of the Bishop. On this subject the Rev. Dr. Sherwood first of all brought forward his resolution, proposed at the last Annual Convention, which was to the following effect:—

"Whereas, the Rt. Rev. Benjamin T. Onderdonk, D.D., Bishop of the diocese of New York, was, on the 3rd day of January, 1845, by a sentence of his Peers, the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, as a judicial tribunal assembled, indefinitely suspended from all exercise of his episcopal and ministerial functions; which sentence still continues in full force:

"Whereas, this sentence of indefinite suspension of the Rt. Rev. B. T. Onderdonk, D.D., does in its very nature and of necessity reach, and most injuriously affect, and, for aught that appears to the contrary, on the part of the tribunal that inflicted it, and which alone has the power now to remit or terminate it, may, for many years to come, continue thus to affect, the best interests, the just rights, and the acknowledged independence of the Church in the diocese of New York, depriving it not only of the parental care, essential services, and watchful supervision of its own constitutional head, but also of all voice and representation in the higher branch of the General Councils of the

Church; hereby, in the language of one of the majority of that tribunal, 'making many suffer for the sake of one, and indirectly punishing the innocent along with the guilty:'

"Whereas, the Constitution and Canons of the Church give to no earthly tribunal the power, *in this manner* 'to make many suffer for the sake of one, and to punish the innocent along with the guilty;' or, *in this way* to deprive, for so long and indefinite a period, a Diocese of the right and privilege of having the services of its own Bishop, and thus to destroy that Diocesan equality and independence which are guaranteed to every member of our Ecclesiastical Confederacy:

"Whereas, the Convention of the Diocese of New York did, at its last session, in 1847, pass unanimously the following resolutions, viz.:

"'Resolved, As the solemn conviction of this Convention, that justice to the Church in the Diocese of New York, as well as its best interests, demand that it be relieved from its present anomalous position.

"'Resolved, That the General Convention be, and is hereby, requested to give to the Church, in this Diocese, such relief as may be consistent with its powers.

"'Resolved, That a copy of the foregoing resolutions be transmitted to the next General Convention.'

"Whereas, these Resolutions were transmitted to the last General Convention, in 1847, and were by that body then considered and acted upon:

"Whereas, the said General Convention, though repudiating the principle of indefinite suspension—declaring by Canon—'Whenever the penalty of suspension shall be inflicted on a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in this Church, the sentence shall specify on what terms, or at what time said penalty shall cease;' and though recognizing and establishing the fact, before doubted by some, that the Right Rev. B. T. Onderdonk is still the Bishop of the Diocese of New York, yet did not grant that relief desired by the Convention of the Diocese of New York, as an act of justice to the Church in the said Diocese, but turned the whole or chief matters of our Diocesan difficulties over to the action and decision of the house of Bishops, in which body the Church in this Diocese has, and so long as this sentence shall continue, can have, no voice or representation:

"Whereas, the house of Bishops have declared, in a formal and official manner, to the Bishop, and to the Diocese of New York, that, although the remission of the sentence inflicted upon the Right Rev. B. T. Onderdonk 'is a possible event in contemplation of law,' yet add, 'they consider the probability of its occurrence so slender and remote as scarcely to afford a reasonable basis for future action,' hereby giving us to understand that there is little or no hope for that relief to the Church in this Diocese, which we have declared 'justice and her best interests demand,' and that we must be content to realize, and, for an unknown period, to suffer, all 'the perplexing and interminable evils which' another of the majority of that tribunal so clearly foresaw, and so forcibly said, 'might be expected to result from leaving the Diocese of New

York in connexion with a Bishop suspended from the exercise of his Episcopal functions :'

" Whereas, this Convention owes it to itself, to the Diocese of New York, and to the Church at large, to assert the rights and maintain the independence and equality of its Diocesan character ; and feels, moreover, bound to use and exhaust all lawful and peaceful measures, to bring to a righteous termination the difficulties under which we now are and so long have been labouring ; to restore quietness and peace to the Church in this Diocese ; and, if possible, to regain the independence of her Diocesan character :

" And whereas, the house of Bishops can grant relief in no other way than by terminating or modifying the sentence they have inflicted upon the Right Rev. B. T. Onderdonk, the Bishop of the Diocese. Therefore,

" Resolved, That the standing committee of the diocese of New York be requested to present forthwith an address to the house of Bishops, asking them to terminate at once the sentence of suspension, inflicted by them upon the Right Rev. B. T. Onderdonk ;—or, if unprepared to do this, and thinking the honour and purity of the Church not yet sufficiently vindicated, to request them to specify on what terms, or at what time, said sentence of suspension shall cease."

On the plea of these resolutions, which brought the subject before the Convention, in the regular order of the day, the Rev. Dr. Higbee proposed, with the consent of Dr. Sherwood, who withdrew his own, the following resolutions, as a substitute :—

" Whereas, the house of Bishops and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, in the General Convention of 1847, passed a canon in the words following :

" ' Whenever the penalty of suspension shall be inflicted on a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, in this Church, the sentence shall specify on what terms, or at what time said penalty shall cease.' And

" Whereas, the Diocese and Diocesan of New York have been for a long time suffering under the disabilities which it was the design of the Canon to prevent in future—Therefore

" Resolved, That the Standing Committee be requested to present, at an early day, an address to the house of Bishops, praying that venerable body to adopt such measures as may render the wise provisions of said Canon of 1847 available to the relief of our Diocese : that so the objects may be accomplished of the unanimous prayer of this Convention, addressed to the General Convention of 1847."

To this an amendment was moved by the Rev. Dr. Whitehouse, consisting of a preamble, the two first clauses of which were the same as the two first clauses of Dr. Sherwood's preamble ; after which it ran thus :—

" Whereas, the house of Bishops can grant relief in no other way than by terminating or modifying the sentence they have inflicted upon the Right Rev. B. T. Onderdonk, the Bishop of the Diocese, the probability of which relief is in itself ' so slender and remote :'

" Whereas, if the house of Bishops should specify on what terms, and

at what time, the penalty should cease, the resumption of Episcopal functions by the Right Rev. Bishop Onderdonk would be hazardous to the well-being and unity of the Church in this Diocese:

"Therefore, Resolved, That this Convention, in the name of the Church, here in council assembled, with solemn sense of the exigency, with deep solicitude for the removal of the disabilities under which we labour, in the surest and safest manner—and in due sympathy with the feelings of the suspended Bishop—does earnestly and affectionately beg the Right Rev. Bishop Onderdonk to resign—as far as he has the power so to do—the jurisdiction of the Diocese of New York, according to the provisions of Canon IV. of the General Convention of 1844.

"Resolved, That, in the event of such resignation, this Convention will pay to the Right Rev. B. T. Onderdonk, from the fund for the support of the Episcopate, or from some other source hereafter to be provided, the sum of two thousand dollars per annum, payable quarterly, for the term of his natural life; and, in the event of his decease, with her survivorship, the sum of one thousand dollars, yearly, to the widow of the said Bishop Onderdonk, for the remainder of her natural life.

"Resolved, That while thus convinced that the said B. T. Onderdonk cannot resume Episcopal functions in this Diocese, with any prospect of usefulness to the Church or comfort to himself, this Convention, in the event of a resignation being consummated, will unite in an earnest petition to the house of Bishops that the said Right Rev. Bishop Onderdonk may be relieved from all disabilities, and restored to the full exercise of such clerical and Episcopal functions as are allowed to a Bishop who has resigned his jurisdiction.

"Resolved, That a committee of ———— on the part of this Convention wait on the Right Rev. Bishop Onderdonk with these resolutions, and respectfully present them, with such statement of the anxiety, feeling, and sufferings of the Church in this Diocese as may give weight to their purport, and in some measure express the deep emotions of its Clergy and Laity."

Before these resolutions were printed and ready to be submitted to the Convention, Dr. Whitehouse was induced to alter his mind, and when the subject came on for discussion, he withdrew three of his resolutions, and adhered only to that which called upon the Bishop to resign, and appeared to him the only way to dispose of the question with honour to themselves and the person lying under disabilities. Personally, in view of the value and importance of such a step to the diocese, he was prepared to make the pecuniary provision to which one of the other resolutions pointed: but for various reasons he contented himself with urging a request for resignation on the part of the suspended Bishop.

After considerable discussion, in the course of which some bitter personal attacks against Bishop Onderdonk were introduced, the sense of the house was taken on the question of resignation as proposed by Dr. Whitehouse, by ayes and noes and orders, when the resolution was lost, the votes being:—Ayes,—clergy, 30; laity, 44. Noes,—clergy, 98; laity, 70.

The vote was then, without further debate, taken upon Dr. Higbee's resolution, when the numbers were:—Ayes,—clergy, 91; laity, 69. Noes,—clergy, 36; laity, 46.

A protest was about to be proposed, to be entered on the journals, but the Convention refused to entertain the motion, which was negatived by the following votes:—Clergy,—ayes, 29; noes, 84:—laity, ayes, 29; noes, 61.

This difficult question being thus disposed of, the Convention, after transacting some current business, adjourned, *sine die*, in the usual manner.

The protest which was rejected by the Convention, has since been published in the American papers. It is dated, New York, September 28th, 1849, and signed by 27 clergymen and 41 laymen, and runs as follows:—

"We, the undersigned, members of the Convention of the Diocese of New York, under a deep sense of our responsibility to the great Head of the Church, do most solemnly

"Protest against the act of this Convention, calling upon the house of Bishops for a termination of the sentence whereby the Right Rev. Benjamin T. Onderdonk, D.D., was suspended from the office of a Bishop in the Church of God.

"The Convention has never ventured to complain that a judgment pronounced by the highest judicial tribunal known in the Church, was in any respect illegal; it has not ventured to assert either the innocence of the suspended Bishop or his subsequent penitence and reformation; and in resting the application to have the judgment set aside, only on the ground of the inconvenience to which it subjects the Diocese, the criminality of the Bishop under suspension is tacitly admitted.

"If then the Right Rev. B. T. Onderdonk, D.D., was unworthy, at the time of receiving his sentence, to exercise the office of a Christian Bishop, that unworthiness has been highly aggravated, not only by the absence of all indications of repentance, but also by his denial of facts most abundantly proved, and by his accusations against the 'law, the court, and the witnesses.'

"Under these circumstances, it is our complete conviction that no temporary inconvenience experienced by the diocese is for one moment to be compared to the awful amount of injury which would result to the cause of Christianity and our Church, by the restoration to his high spiritual functions of an impenitent Bishop, convicted of gross immorality.

"We feel assured that it is as little worthy the Convention as it is positively disrespectful to the House of Bishops, to suppose that such a body of Christian Prelates are to be induced to abandon their deliberately formed convictions of what they owe to the purity of the Church of God, merely by the insensibility this Convention may evince to the most serious moral delinquencies in asking for the termination or modification of such a sentence. Viewing then, as we do, the restoration of the Right Rev. Bishop Onderdonk to the exercise of his Epis-

copal functions, as being pregnant with the most wide-spread and withering evils to the cause of religion, as inflicting an indelible disgrace upon the Christian Ministry, as in our view in direct contravention of the rights secured to us by the Constitution and Canons, and as being fatal to the unity, harmony, and usefulness of our Church; we do most earnestly and solemnly protest against it, and before God and man do we disclaim all responsibility for the flood of mischief which must flow from such an outrage upon the religious sensibilities of our people, and so reckless a defiance of the just indignation of the whole Christian world."

Considering the aspect which the case has now assumed, our readers may not be sorry to have placed under their eyes, in addition to the foregoing official proceedings, a letter which discusses the whole question very fully and temperately, and which appears in the columns of the *New York Churchman*:—

To the Right Reverend Father in God, Philander Chase, D.D., Bishop of Illinois.

"Right Reverend Sir,—Another year having brought round the Convention of the Diocese of New York, its present unhappy and imperfect condition is naturally forced afresh upon the recollection of all who are interested in the welfare of Zion.

"You will probably remember, when you see the signature, that I am not immediately connected with your branch of the Church Catholic, but I will not fear your asking, what right I have to interfere in the matter, because, as an aged prelate, you must have often felt the force of that declaration of the Apostle respecting the Church—'the Body of Christ,' 'And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it!'

"I address you, Right Reverend Sir, because, as the senior Bishop of the Church in the United States, it seems proper that the first authoritative step towards the relief of the Diocese of New York from its present oppressed state should be taken by yourself; and because, as your venerable years proclaim that you must, ere very long, be called to render an account of your high and awful office, I would hope that you are so prepared by the pure and charitable Spirit of Christ for a blessed entrance into His presence, as to be able now to review all the circumstances connected with the late trial of the Right Reverend Father in God, Benjamin T. Onderdonk, D.D., Bishop of New York, uninfluenced by that party and wrathful feeling which perhaps might at the time have unwittingly influenced even your judgment, venerable sir; for you know the Church teaches us that 'this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated.'

"I wish then to draw your attention, first, to the fact that the Bench of Bishops in the United States are at the present time inflicting a grievous wrong upon the diocese of New York, by forcibly and arbitrarily, without its own consent and beyond the power of its own control, depriving it, for an uncertain and indefinite period, of the care and

superintendence of a Bishop of its own; thereby placing it under the guidance and control of a committee of presbyters and laymen; a mode of government which is nowhere recognized in the Bible, and to which, therefore, no peculiar unction of the Holy Spirit is in any way promised! An act of Episcopal oppression this, which, so far as my limited knowledge extends, is unparalleled in the annals of the Catholic Church!

"I am sure, sir, that you would not wish to enter the eternal world without first having the solemn conviction that you had done every thing in your power to remedy so unscriptural a state of things; especially as it was your unhappiness to be one of the principal agents in bringing this unfortunate diocese into this very sad condition. For if a Bishop be one of Christ's most important legacies to His Church, then to be deprived of one for years together must be a fearful injury; and no one can have better opportunity than yourself, Right Reverend Sir, of knowing that the transient visits of prelates, whose own dioceses demand all their care, can by no means make up the loss.

"That for this act of oppression against the diocese of New York the house of Bishops is alone responsible, is clear from the character of the sentence passed upon their Bishop, which is indefinite suspension. Now, so long as the Bishop is only 'suspended,' his diocese cannot elect another, however they might desire to do so;—and it is the house of Bishops only who are competent to reverse the sentence, or to increase it to 'degradation;' by either of which the diocese would be again restored to its scriptural and Catholic integrity. What makes the wrong done to this diocese yet more glaringly unrighteous is, that the trial and condemnation of their Bishop was entirely unsought by its members as a body!

"I am aware that it was always hoped, by many of those who sentenced the Bishop of New York, that he would resign the episcopate, and that in this way his diocese would become free to choose a successor. But, venerable sir, was it justice to that large and important portion of the flock of Christ to leave them at the mercy of a man whom a majority of his judges had declared to be so vile as no longer to be fit to have the rule over them? Ah, sir! surely their expecting such an act of self-denial from Bishop Onderdonk is proof that his episcopal brethren could not really have believed him to be the fallen man they professed to have supposed him! And yet on the other hand, if innocent, it was surely probable that he might feel that to resign would be giving place to the devil, (false accusations,—at least, most uncharitable constructions,) and thereby encourage the evil one again to stir up false accusers against the brethren. Or, under the circumstances, it might have been supposed probable, that he would suspect that the chief motive for his accusation and condemnation was to be found in the exception they took 'against him concerning the law of his God,' and that therefore to resign would be to enable his enemies to give, through him, a deadly thrust at what he considers the purity of 'the faith once delivered to the saints.' But, however these things

might be, it is evident that all law forbids that the innocent shall unnecessarily be made to suffer with the guilty; much more does this hold with respect to a large body of the Church of Christ, and one who is judged to be an unfaithful pastor; I contend, therefore, that a legal, moral, religious, and very bitter wrong has been done to the innocent diocese of New York, in thus heedlessly, cruelly, and unrighteously confounding it with its supposed guilty Bishop.

"But pardon me, Right Reverend Sir, if in the next place I state that the American bench of bishops stands before all the world, self-condemned in this matter; for that they have recently passed a canon to the purport, that hereafter no Bishop shall be subject to 'indefinite' suspension! Why surely, surely, Fathers of the Church of God in the United States! what will be a wrong either to the Church or the individual to-morrow, cannot be right to-day! Oh, my Fathers, how painful an evidence does this afford that you are conscious of having acted in the late 'trial' with unrighteous severity! or at least with a want of holy wisdom! But if so, will you then, ye humble Fathers of the Church, be too proud to undo, as far as in you lies, so serious, so fatal an error? Oh, I would fain hope not!

"Permit, then, an humble presbyter to suggest even to his Fathers in Christ, that the first thing to be done is, to determine, at all hazards, to do right! A grievous injustice has been done, as I have shown, by your means, to the diocese of New York: this must be undone, if you would not be found, it may be, with the blood of souls in the skirts of your garments. You, many of you, I doubt not, from whatever cause, believe Bishop Onderdonk unfit to resume the powers of the episcopate: be it so; but remember this is not the only, nor, at the present time, the most important question; we are not to do evil that good may come! But it is an evil, and a most unrighteous oppression, to deprive an innocent diocese of its Bishop for an unlimited series of years;—this sin therefore must be got rid of, if you yourselves would be pure in the sight of God; even though the painful alternative were to restore a very faulty Bishop to his diocese. May not then a special session of the house of Bishops be called, and the case of the Bishop of New York be again reviewed; and, if a righteous and charitable equity requires it, may not the Bishop be fully 'degraded;' or, if his judges tremble thus to crush their brother, remembering the day when they shall with him stand side by side, to be all judged at another tribunal; then, what is to prevent their revoking a sentence which, by their own late canon, they have themselves declared to be unjust? and thus, by one or other of these methods, relieving the diocese from its state of unholy oppression? And this last, the restoration of the Bishop, might be conscientiously voted for by those of his brethren who are far from believing him innocent, on the plain and avowed ground that they can no longer consent to do evil that good may come, by continuing to oppress, through the tyrannical exercise of episcopal power, the innocent for the sake of punishing him whom they esteem as guilty.

"Another reason for urging a review of the Bishop's case arises from

the fact, that while his friends say that additional proof of his innocence can be adduced, I have heard it said, on the other hand, that there are matters of accusation which are perhaps worse than any that were brought forward on the trial, and which make his restoration utterly impossible! But surely, Sir, this method of dark insinuation cannot be the justice of the American Church? For, first, this stabbing of a man in the dark, much more a chief ruler in the Church of Christ, would disgrace a pagan! And, secondly, who that had one spark of love to the purity or peace of the Bride of Christ, would permit her to suffer as she is doing in the Diocese of New York, when, if these insinuations are not damnable falsehoods, they know those things of its guilty head which, by causing his instant and unquestioned removal, and so enabling the diocese to elect a holier chief, would at once restore peace within its distracted borders!

"Permit me, then, Right Reverend Sir, most respectfully to remark in conclusion, that it is due to the character of the American bench of Bishops, due to the holy rights of the oppressed Diocese of New York, due to Bishop Onderdonk himself, and, above all, due to the honour of Christ, who Himself established Apostolic Episcopacy, that the said Right Reverend B. T. Onderdonk should without further unjust, unscriptural, and ruinous delay, be at once, either restored to his Diocese, or altogether degraded from his high and holy office.

"I have the honour to remain, with profound veneration for your sacred office, Right Reverend Sir, your obedient humble servant in Christ, "A Catholic.

"*Canada West, Oct.* 8, 1849."

Secession to Rome.—A great sensation has been created at New York by the secession to Rome of the Rev. Dr. Forbes, a divine of nearly twenty years' standing in the American Church. Not only had he, up to a very late period, held the charge of the parish of St. Luke's, in New York, to which he was appointed in 1834, but he had, at different times, filled other important offices; he was twice a delegate to the General Convention, in 1844 and in 1847; and has been a Trustee of the Theological Seminary since 1835; and a member of its Standing Committee since 1846. In 1844 he was one of the principal defenders of Church principles during the discussions which took place at the General Convention in Philadelphia. In 1847, in the discussion of the unhappy case of Bishop Onderdonk, the course which he took was less favourable to the suspended Bishop than that of the party with which he generally acted. Nothing had transpired to lead to a suspicion that his allegiance to the Church was shaken till very recently, when rumours of his proposed secession got abroad, but were disregarded by many, until the appearance in the public prints of the following document:—

"*New York*, 21*st Nov.* 1849.

"To the Rev. Wm. Berrian, D.D., President of the Standing Committee of the diocese of New York.

"Rev. and dear Sir,—You may conceive that it is with no ordinary

emotion that I feel myself constrained to declare to you, as President of the Standing Committee of the diocese of New York, that it is my intention no longer to exercise the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church, it having become my deep and conscientious conviction that duty to God requires of me to unite myself to the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church in communion with the See of Rome, to which alone I feel that my allegiance is due. With great personal consideration, I remain, Rev. and dear Sir, your obedient servant,

"JOHN MURRAY FORBES."

It is expected that others, both clergymen and laymen, will follow the example of Dr. Forbes, and that the result of the secession will be a depression of Church principles, and a reaction in favour of Puritanical views, in the American Church. It was currently reported at New York that a special meeting of the house of Bishops had been called for; but the report was contradicted.

Distressed State of the Missionary Fund.—We stated in our last the difficulties under which the domestic missions of the American Church are labouring. In consequence of these, and in pursuance of the resolutions passed in June last, the domestic Committee of Church Missions have issued an urgent appeal to the different congregations throughout the States for support, reminding them that the Church stands pledged to the support of the different missionary Bishops and Missionaries, who have gone forth to plant the Gospel in the West, upon the faith of the promises made to them on behalf of the Church. According to their statement, a year's salary was due to nearly all the Missionaries on the 1st of October last, the mission board being under an aggregate liability of twenty thousand dollars. They report various retrenchments in the expenses of administration, and reductions in missionary stipends, to the amount of nearly ten thousand dollars compared with the preceding year; notwithstanding which, a sum of forty-two thousand dollars will be required, "in order that at the meeting of the next General Convention, the Church shall have redeemed the pledges made to her Bishops and Missionaries." They urge that "already despair is doing its work, and Missionaries are leaving stations of importance and promise, compelled by starving necessity to seek some other place of labour." The Bishops have sanctioned the resolution of the Board of Missions, appointing the First Sunday in Advent as the day for making missionary collections throughout the Union.

INDEX

OF THE

REMARKABLE PASSAGES IN THE CRITICISMS, EXTRACTS, NOTICES, AND INTELLIGENCE.

Absolution, Rev. William Maskell's inquiry into the doctrine of, 196; he acknowledges that sacerdotal absolution not essential to the remission of sins, 197; but asserts that absolution must be preceded by special confession of sin, 198; the authority for this assertion not established, 199; and opposed by the fact of the absolutions given by synods, 200; and by the practice of the whole Church, 201; the view of the Church of England before the Reformation, 202; the word "Minister" taken to signify Priest, 203; remarks on the principle on which Mr. Maskell's appeal to authority is conducted, 204; unsupported by our formularies or the writings of our Divines, 205.

Adelaide, Bishop of, his protest against popish intrusion, 475.

Alford, Rev. H., his annotations on the Gospels, 444; his learning, research, and piety, 445; he maintains the distinctness and independence of the four Gospels, 446; his assertion that the present Gospel of St. Matthew is only a compilation from the original Hebrew, 447.

Apostolical Epistles, the, call for an inexhaustible exercise of searching, sifting, and pondering, 436; extracts from Dr. Peile's annotations on St. Paul's Epistles, 437—439.

Apostolical Succession, this doctrine proved from Rom. i. 5, 43; and the reconstruction of synods advocated by Dr. Peile, 440.

Bailey, Mr., remarks on his "Festus," 386.

Bishops, mode of appointing, under the Carlovingian dynasty of France, 213.

Bowyer, Mr., his tabular statement of alterations in workhouse schools at his tours of inspection, 125.

Brandenburg, memoirs of the House of, by Leopold Ranke, 395; a subordinate state, 396; character of Frederick William I., 397; his tyranny and ill humour to his children, 398; he insists on his daughter's marrying, 399; his severity to his son, 400; whom he imprisons, 401; his wife, Sophia Dorothea, 402; George I. of England, and the wife of Peter the Great, 403; the Margravine of Bareith, 404; party squabbles about precedence and etiquette, 405; Frederick the Great, 406; his neglect of his wife, 407; seizes on the kingdom of Silesia, 408; institutes the order of knighthood called from his name, 409; opposed to royal power in the government of the nation, 410; comparison between him and Philip of Macedon, 411; his friendship and quarrel with Voltaire, 412; lamentable death-bed of Frederick William, 413; Ranke's interesting account of the legal reforms, 414; the number and length of lawsuits, 415; his improvements in agriculture and commerce, 416; details of Professor Ranke's book uninteresting to the general reader, 417.

Browne, Mr., his report on the religious instruction in schools, 121.

"*Bull*" *and* "*Bear*" in Stock Exchange language, explained, 455.

Bulwer Lytton, Sir E., remarks on his "King Arthur," 381.

Bute, Lord, remarks of Frederick the Great on him, and the English political system of that day, 410.

Calvinistic Controversy, the, ably elucidated in Mr. Houghton's useful systematic treatise, 451.

Canada, the Conquest of, by Captain Warburton, 153; Sebastian Cabot's voyage of discovery, 154; expedition of Cortereal, Ponce de Leon, and Veragzano, 155; of Gomez, 156; of Jacques Cartier, 157; his second expedition to the

Gulf of St. Lawrence, 158; friendly reception of the natives, 159; he discovers the city of Hochelaga, 160; brings home the chief Donnacona to France, 161; Champlain the governor of New France, 162; the character and condition of the country at the time of its occupation by Europeans, 163; the adjustment of the boundaries of the English and French territories, 164; success of English arms secured by Pitt's appointment of Amherst and Wolfe, 165; the capture of Louisburgh, 166; the cruelties perpetrated in the war, 167; Montcalm's fatal error in quitting the shelter of the fortifications of Quebec, 168; the siege and fall of Quebec, 169; the heroic death of Wolfe, 170.

Capital Punishment, views of Frederick the Great on, 408.

Cathedral Establishments, Rev. Mr. Whiston's pamphlet on, 88; their origin and subsequent history, 89; Henry VIII. the founder of fourteen, 90; extract from the first chapter of the Statutes of Canterbury and Durham, 91; deacons attached to each chapter, 92; also subdeacons, 92; the salaries for these, with deaconry in some instances, in favour of divinity lecture, 94; alterations in the cathedral system, 95; the causes to which such alterations are to be attributed, 96; neglect of episcopal visitation, 97; consequent deviations from statutes and founder's injunctions, 98; Mr. Hope's speech on the neglect of episcopal visitation, 99; the sad consequences of the present system of appointment to bishoprics, 100; making the Church the slave of the State, 101; and causing the appointment of worldly-minded men, 102; Mr. Horsman's speech on the increase of bishops, 103; quotes Lord Henley's plan of Church reform, 104; the creation of suffragan bishoprics, 105; the cathedrals no longer parish churches, 106.

Church of England, history of the, by J. B. S. Carwithen, B.D., 418; importance of the study of Church history, 419; the Church and State distinct in their existences, 420; the State in collision with the Church, 421; their present relations most unsatisfactory, 422; religious duties correlative with the regal supremacy, 423; and separated from them, the doctrine of State supremacy to be rejected and abhorred, 424; the present aspect of this question, 425; the remedy to be sought, 426; in the restoration of Convocation, 427; in an altered mode of appointing bishops, 428; in the increase of the episcopate, 429; requirements of the times, 430; commended to the faithful sons of the Church, 431.

Church of England, the, its origin not due to St. Augustine's mission, well maintained by Mr. Mangin in his Catechism of Church History, 434.

Church Synods, the restoration or reconstruction of, advocated by Dr. Peile in his Annotations on Rom. i. 5 and Acts xv., 440.

Colombo, the establishment of a new college proposed, 225.

Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit, 247; general remarks on the inspiration of Holy Scripture, 248; rationalistic doctrines on this point, 249; Mr. Nelson Coleridge vindicates his father's tenets from some statements in this Review, 250; their agreement shown with those of Blanco White, Sterling, and Froude, 251; Mr. Green's "Introduction" shows them to have been derived from Lessing, 252; who is really an infidel writer, 253; unsettled state of Coleridge's mind, 254; he asserts the existence of an inward inspiration, 255; denies the infallibility of Holy Scripture, 256; or any but a *collective* inspiration, 257; his mode of dealing with infidels, 258; identity of his views with those of Lessing, 259; and of Froude, in the "Nemesis of Faith," 260; who also rejects the inspiration of Scripture, 261; calling it, with Froude, "ventriloquism," 262; identity of Sterling's views with these, 263; and of Carlyle, 264; and of Blanco White in general principle, though not in detail, 265; extracts from his Life to prove this, 266; reason and conscience are with each of them made the arbiter of all doctrine, 267; remarks on these principles, 268; difficulties about the text no proof that Scripture is not a Divine Revelation, 269; reason never an infallible monitor, 270; the happiness and consistency of the Christian faith, 271.

Cornish, Rev. G., late Vicar of Kenwyn, touching Memoir of, 471.

Emerson, Mr., the popularity of his Essays a sad sign, 139; the inconsistency and yet narrow limits of his system, 140; Emerson compared with Carlyle, 141;

his Essay on "History," 142; its self-contradiction and Atheism, 143; on "Self-Reliance," 144; it denounces prayer as a "disease of the will," 145; anathematises travelling, 146; Essays on "Compunction or Spiritual Laws," and on "Love," 147; on "Friendship," 148; on "Circles," 149; on "Intellect," 150; on "Art," 151; self-idolatry narrows the range of thoughts and perceptions by the exclusion of our fellow-man and of God, 152.

English Language, dislike of Frederick the Great to the, 409.

Episcopate, Table of the, of the Reformed Catholic Church, 223.

Evangelische Kirchen-Zeitung, a series of articles in, on neological unbelief, 287.

Flattery, Rev. W. Jackson's Sermon on, 448.

Harington, Chancellor, his defence of the Anglican Church from the imputations of Mr. Macaulay, 209; whose assertions as regards Cranmer and the other Reformers are not in accordance with historical testimony, 210.

Henley, Lord, his plan of Church Reform quoted by Mr. Horsman, 104.

Hobbes, his theory of the angels mentioned in Scripture, 279.

Holy City, Mr. Williams' historical, topographical, and antiquarian notice of the, 171; the contents of each volume, 172; some remarks on the ark as deposited in the tabernacle, 173; on the discovery of Beer-lahai-roi, 174; and of Kadesh, 175; on the meaning of "Millo," 176; on the Samaritans, 177; account of Herod the Great, 178; his dreadful death, 179; the sacking of the Holy City by the victorious armies in the first Crusade, 180; Mr. Ponjoulat's opinion of the influence of France in the future condition of Palestine, 181; French and Russian "combination" improbable, 182; alterations in the plan of the city of Jerusalem, 183; Mr. Williams' investigation of Dr. Robinson's arguments, 184; the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, 185; the plan of the exterior walls, 186; the interior division of the city, 187; Acra, as described by Josephus and Dr. Robinson, 188, 189; Mr. Williams' theory on this subject, 190; the situation of Begetha, 191; the present site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre the true one, 192; its present appearance, 193; concluding remarks on Mr. Williams' work, 194; the gold medal for science awarded to it by the King of Prussia, 195.

Hope, Mr., his eloquent speech on the neglect of episcopal visitation of chapters of cathedrals, 98.

Horsman, Mr., his "Five Speeches" on faults alleged against the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, 102.

Houghton, Rev. W., his most useful and systematic treatise on the Calvinistic Controversy, 451.

Humboldt, Baron Wilhelm von, his Letters to a lady, 449.

Immaculate Conception of the Virgin, the French Bishops support the Pope's intention of declaring this an article of the Faith, 226—235; the question discussed in the Roman Catholic synod at Baltimore, 243.

Inspectors, list of the five appointed by Government for the inspection of schools, and their respective districts of inspection, 119.

Inspiration, the doctrine of the plenary, verbal inspiration of Holy Scripture defended by Dr. Kitto, 213.

Intemperance in Scotland, report of the Committee for its suppression, 459; its increase, 460, 461

Jackson, Rev. J., his Sermons on "Little besetting Sins," 447; and on Flattery, 448.

"*John Bull*" an article in it first draws attention to the Government scheme of education, 109.

Katt, Lieutenant, his friendship for Frederic the Great, 401.

Keble, Rev. J., his lines on "Pebbles on the Shore," 218.

Kelly, Rev. J., extract from his Sermon on the Redemption of Christ, 457.

Lampen, Rev. R. late vicar of S. Probus, touching Memoir of, 471.

Lawsuits, the number and length of, during the reign of Frederic the Great, 415.

Maitland's Essays on the Dark Ages, his controversial writings, 65; dangers of controversy, 66; imputations of falsehood to historians of the Reformation, 67; in the case of George Joye of Peter House, Cambridge, 68; of Anthony Dalabee, of St. Alban's Hall,

69; of Thomas Green, 70; of Careless, a weaver of Coventry, 71; Dr. Maitland an apologist for Queen Mary; Bonner and Gardiner, 72; at the expense of the adherents of the Reformation, 73; he attacks the writings of Bale and Poynet, of Winchester, 74; accuse the English and Scotch exiles of seditious language, 75; not proved, from the absence of dates, 76; and of knavery and falsehood on the subject of the female succession to the throne, 77; Bishop Aylmer's answer to John Knox, 78; the charge of dishonesty not against it, 79; Thomas Cromwell painted in the blackest colours, 80; Cranmer and others accused of *ribaldry* in their contempt of superstition, 81; extracts from Strype on this subject, 82; attempted justification of the act of Six Articles, 83; Dr. Maitland's inaccuracy and want of precision, 84; his defence of Bishop Gardiner, 85; and of Bishop Bonner, 86; his prejudice against the adherents of the Reformation, 87.

Maitland, Dr. his Dissertation on the sepulchral inscriptions of the catacombs in his "Church of the Catacombs," 49.

Manning, Archdeacon, extracts from his Charge on the Clergy as the guardians of education, 138.

Marshall, Mr. his "Developments of Protestantism," 452; rewarded by Government for his apostasy from the Church by an inspectorship of schools, 453.

Melancthon, his anticipation of the rise of neological unbelief, 287.

Modern Angelogy impregnated with heathen elements, 272; would derive Hebrew Angelogy from the dualistic principles of the Magi, at the Babylonic Exile, 273; spread of these views in England, 274; Dr. Lamb's notions of the Fall, 275; and of the nature of Satanic influence, 276; denies that the authors of it were *fallen Angels*, 277; his views disproved from Holy Scripture, 278; the views of "Phileleutherus Anglicanus" borrowed from Hobbes and Strauss, 279; denies the existence of any personal Angel in the earlier books of the Old Testament, 280; Dr. Mills' and Ode's investigations on this subject, 281: notices of Satan given us before the Fall, 282; and in the book of Job, 283; Winer also denies the personality of Angels, 284; his views confuted by Holy Scripture, 285; warnings of the heterodoxy of these books, 286; such views censured, by anticipation, by Melancthon, 287.

Mills, Dr., on the existence of superhuman beings, 281.

Napier, Mr., his Speeches as M.P. for the University of Dublin, 14.

National Education, the present unjustifiable attempts of the Government on this subject our punishment for former concessions of principle, 435.

Newton, Rev. H., his wrath against all critical censure, 468; his absurd verses on "Antichrist" and the "Flight of the Apostate," 469; some warnings and advice for him, 470.

Palmer's Appeal to the Scottish Bishops and Clergy on the question of the relations of the English and Russian Churches, 288; an outline of Mr. Palmer's transactions on this subject, 289; these and his Journal of too personal a nature, 290; letters to the Primate and the Bishop of London, 291; remarks on the Bishop's views of the admission of communicants from foreign Churches, 292; difficulties attending this question, 293; impossible without forsaking the Russian Communion, 294; this not acknowledged by Mr. Palmer, 295; the union of Christendom not to be promoted by the compromise of great truths, 296; Mr. Palmer refused admission into the Russian Communion, 297; appeals to the Scottish Bishops to sanction his anathemas of Calvinistic heresies, 298; they refuse to enter on the examination of his propositions, 299; this appeal failing, he imprudently pledges himself to become a member of the Russian Communion, 300; declares the Western Church heretical in the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost, 301; the result of Mr. Palmer's exertions, 302.

Papacy in Exile, the. The pope deposed in May, 1848, 344; Count Rossi's assassination, 345; decree of the Roman Assembly proclaiming a republic, 346; the proclamation of the ministry, 347; Mazzini's deism and republicanism, 348; clever but fallacious article in the *Quarterly* on this subject, 349. 357; Mazzini's discourse on the *unification* of Tuscany with Rome, 350; the constitution of the Roman republic, 351; observes a total silence respecting the papacy, 352; Cardinal Antonelli's memorial to the courts of Europe on be-

half of the Pope, 353; recounts the late events at Rome, 354, 355; and calls on foreign powers to aid him, 356; appeals to the "Queen of Heaven" for protection, 357; the Revolution the work of the people, 358; the Pope cannot substantiate any *political* right to his sovereignty, 359; it is founded on a religious theory, 360; must be accepted by the people, 361; it is not only *de facto* but *de jure* extinct, 362; foreign interference unjustifiable, 363; duplicity and perfidy of France, 364; an expedition sent to ensure Rome against a restoration of the Pope, 365; protest of the Roman republic against the French invasion, 366; proclamation of General Oudinot, 367; counter proclamation of the Roman triumvirate, 368; Oudinot censured by the National Assembly, and M. Lesseps sent as special envoy, 369; his first account of the state of Rome, 370; his opinion of Mazzini, 371; Mazzini's description of Rome in May, 372; the state of finances, 373; a clerical administration cannot be restored, 374; conduct of England in this matter, 375; diplomatic communications with Rome, 376; and spiritual supremacy of the Pope acknowledged, 377.

Parish schoolmasters, a few words to, the importance of their work, 51; the danger of a too exclusively intellectual education, 52; a Christian character requisite, 53; acquirements valuable, but not above moral qualities, 54; danger of an unappreciated contact with sacred things, 55; scholastic deficiencies, how remedied, 56; temptations and trials of the schoolmaster, 57; their consequent effects on the master, 58; and on the pupils, 59; a pastoral care of children enjoined, 60; counsel, support, and guidance of the clergy needed by the schoolmaster, 61; constant intercourse and joint prayer, 62; hard, worldly tone of School, 63; to be obviated by affectionate intercourse, 64.

Pauper Education and Kneller Hall, the government scheme, 107; opposed by the Legislature and the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1839, 108; clandestinely carried into effect in 1849, 109; an article in the "John Bull" first draws attention to it, 109, 110; correspondence between Sir George Grey and the Marquis of Lansdowne, 111; workhouse schools subject to, and inspectors and a normal school established under, the authority of the Committee of Council, 112; Mr. Kay Shuttleworth's Paper on Workhouse Schools, 113; the salaries of masters and mistresses, 114; who are to be under the control and superintendence of the Committee of Council, 115; the very disproportionate religious qualification demanded, 116; the dismissal of schoolmasters, 117; the Minutes of the Council enforcing Mr. Kay's suggestions, 118; five inspectors appointed, 119; "Letters of Instruction" for them, 120; the Poor Law chaplain, 121; Mr. Browne's Report on religious instruction in our schools, 122; the effects of teaching a "general religion" in German schools, 123; the Bible as a reading book, 124; discouraged by inspectors, as shown by Mr. Bowyer's Tabular Report of his inspection, 125; the lesson books of the Irish National Education Board introduced, 126; industrial and specially agricultural pursuits advocated by Mr. Symons, 127; greater facilities of teaching workhouse above national school children, 128; the comparative number of children in each, 129; children of *out-door* paupers, 130; the effects of giving a merely secular education to more than half the children of the poor of England, 131; the normal school at Kneller Hall, 132; all Minutes on the internal organization omitted in the Parliamentary Return, 133; statement of expense, 134; misappropriation of funds, 135; capabilities of Kneller Hall, 136; the employment destined for the 80 schoolmasters annually issuing thence, 137; extract from Archdeacon Manning's Charge on the Clergy as the guardians of the education of the poor, 138.

Pilgrimage to Rome, a, by the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour, 322; a minute survey of the Church of Rome as it is, 323; cathedrals as ill attended on the Continent as with us, 324; the original intention of the Cathedral system, 325; fated deprivation of the Canon of the cure of souls, 326; severe remarks on the abuses of the system, 327; three courses proposed for its amendment, 328; which should be adopted by the bishops, 329; scanty attendance in the Cathedral at Lucca, 330; love of sermons as in England, 331; worship of the lower classes of Romanists, 332; of the higher classes, 333; united wor-

ship prevented by the retention of the Latin tongue, 334; monasteries for the higher orders like boarding-houses, 335; filth of those for the lower orders, 336; convents necessary from the state of morals, 337; the ceremony of taking the veil, 338; a very *imposing* one, 339; the exhibition of a boy's preaching, 340; irreverence in church, 341; Mr. Seymour's depreciatory remark on English cathedral service, 342; his book useful and instructive, but requiring revision, 343.

Prayer and Eternal Punishment, Dangers and heretical views on, by the Author of the "Light of Nature," 467.

Prince Rupert and the Cavaliers, by Eliot Warburton. The abiding instance of the subject, 1; the disloyalty of the Parliaments, 2; the difficulties of King Charles, 3; the backwardness and cowardice of his advisers, 4; in the imprisonment of the Bishops, 5; Mr. Warburton but a faint-hearted supporter of the king, 6; his portrait of Falkland, 7; his views of the British Constitution, 8; King Charles' "Eikon Basilike," 9; Prince Rupert's early life, 10; he raises the king's standard at Nottingham, 11, 12; letter from Sir Beville Grenville, 13; execution of Strafford, 14; Hyde, Pym, and Hampden, 15; Rupert and the battle of Edgehill, 16; Hampden's death and character, 17; the battle of Marston Moor, 18; Rupert commences with prayer, 19; he is defeated, 20; considerations on his conduct, 21; the battle of Naseby, and the publication of the king's letters, 22, 23; his martyrdom, 24; Prince Rupert's after-life, 25; King Charles a patron of art, 26; various anecdotes of him, 27; letter from Lord Newcastle, 28; reviews of the times, 29.

Quebec, the siege and fall of, 168.

Roman Catholic Prelates, their precedence protested against by the Bishop of Sydney, 442; referred to Lord Grey, 443; his quibbling answer, 443; protest by the clergy and laity of Sydney, 444. 476.

Saint's Tragedy, the, by the Rev. Charles Kingsley, 378; remarks on Professor Maurice's Preface, 379; on dramatic works in general, 380; not popularly understood, 381; the "Poem" of the Saint's Tragedy, 382; the purpose of the work, 383; injudicious in its exaggerations, 384; true and false asceticism distinguished, 385; Bailey, Bulwer, Taylor, and Kingsley, compared, 386; character of Elizabeth of Hungary, 387; individuality of Mr. Kingsley's character, 388; crusader's song, 389; poetic similes, 390; Elizabeth's discovery of Lorn's love for her, 391; her mental struggles in taking the convent vow, 392; Mr. Kingsley's great power if not abused, 393; warned against party exclusiveness, 394.

Scottish Churches, peculiar features in the architecture of the, 211.

Seven Lamps of Architecture, Mr. Ruskin on the; his denunciation of the practice of pulling down old churches to rebuild them, 221.

Sewell, Rev. William, his noble Sermons on "the Nation, the Church, and the University of Oxford," 473.

Seymour, Rev. Hobart, his "Mornings amongst the Jesuits at Rome," 30; his ability as a controversialist, 31; he is visited by two Jesuits, 32; they converse on the subjects of secession to Rome, 33; of an infallible tribunal of doctrine, 34; not to be found in councils, bulls, &c., 35; the arguments for its existence of its *necessity* examined, 36; discussions with the Professors of Dogmatic Theology, and of Canon Law, on the possibility of salvation in the Church of England, 37; proved by a syllogism, 38; the Church of Rome nowhere authoritatively claims *infallibility*, 39; only supremacy and authority, 40; the argument reviewed, 41; the test to distinguish a fallible from an infallible bull, 42; the conditions defined, 43; the difficulties of taking Scripture for the tribunal, 44; no less difficulties surround the Bullarium, 45; or the decrees of councils, the traditions, &c. &c., 46; Romish and Protestant missions compared, 47; sudden conversions of Indians, 48; sepulchral inscriptions in the Catacombs, 49; Mariolatry in Italy, 50.

Shuttleworth, Mr. Kay, his paper on workhouse schools, 110.

Simrock, Karl, the poetical powers of, 216; his tale of "Der Gute Gerhard von Köln," 217; anathematizes the doctrine of all human meritoriousness, 218.

Southgate, Bishop, his Report of the American Mission at Mossoul, 481.

Stella, anecdotes of her to be found in Wilde's Memoirs of Dean Swift, 480.
Stock Exchange, unceremonious expulsion from the, 454; "Bull," and "Bear" in Stock Exchange language, explained, 455.
Sunset Reverie, the, an extract from the Allegory, 433.
Swift, Dean, his alleged insanity disproved by Mr. Wilde, 451.
Symons, Mr., his Report advocating the introduction of industrial and specially agricultural pursuits in pauper schools, 127.

Taylor, W., remarks on his "Philip van Artenvelden," 386.
The Caxtons, by Sir E. L. Bulwer Lytton, 303; the versatility yet unity of his style, 304; no jealousy of his contemporaries, 305; the Christian tendencies of their writings, 306; the story of the Caxtons, 307; unnatural combination of passion and humour, 308; Pisistratus Caxton's early life, 309; anecdote of a duck, 310; feelings on coming home from school, 311; early rising, 312; admiration for mere scholarship without aim or positive bearing, 313; speaks of the earliest Scripture History as "vague myths," 314; want of "*conviction*" in author and hero, 315; love of parents a motive and treasure for life, 316; emigration to Australia, 317; a masterly extract, showing thorough knowledge of character, 318, 319; various censures on the book, 320; its religious indifference, 321.

Valeric, an Autobiography, by Captain Marryatt, R.N., 218; the pernicious tendency of his works, 219.

Whiston, Rev. Robert, his Pamphlet on Cathedral Trusts contains much information on the subject of cathedral foundations, 88.
Wilmott, Rev. Robert A., his "Journal of Summer-time in the Country," 206; his object in this work, 207; benefits of the contemplation of nature, 208.
Wolfe, General, account of his death, 170.

END OF VOL. XII.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 076144432